

Dynamic Complexity of Parity Games with Bounded Tree-Width*

Patricia Bouyer¹, Vincent Jugé¹, and Nicolas Markey^{1,2}

¹ LSV, CNRS & ENS Cachan, Univ. Paris-Saclay, France

² IRISA, CNRS & Inria & Univ. Rennes 1, France

Abstract

Dynamic complexity is concerned with updating the output of a problem when the input is slightly changed. We study the dynamic complexity of two-player parity games over graphs of bounded tree-width, where updates may add or delete edges, or change the owner or color of states. We show that this problem is in DynFO (with LOGSPACE precomputation); this is achieved by a reduction to a Dyck-path problem on an acyclic automaton.

1 Introduction

Parity games. Games played on graphs are tightly linked with automata and logics. In those games, two players move a token along the edges of a graph, thus forming an infinite sequence of states of the graph; each player tries to make this sequence satisfy her winning condition. Such games provide a rich and powerful formalism for dealing with numerous problems in theoretical computer science, especially for verification and synthesis of reactive systems.

There is a wide range of games on graphs: they can be zero-sum (involving two players with opposite objectives) or non-zero-sum (involving several players that may want to collaborate); players may or may not have full information about the game, and/or perfect observation of the state of the game; strategies may be deterministic or randomized; and various kinds of winning objectives can be considered.

We focus here on two-player perfect-information turn-based (zero-sum) parity games. In such games, the (finitely many) states of the graph are labelled with natural numbers; along each infinite play, the maximal number that appears infinitely many times determines the winner, one of the player trying to make this number even, and the other trying to make it odd. Those games have been extensively studied [17, 8, 24, 14, 9]: deciding the winner in a parity game admits NP and coNP algorithms, but whether this can be achieved in polynomial time remains one of the foremost open problems in this area.

Graphs with bounded tree-width. The tree-width of graphs has been defined by Robertson and Seymour [20] as a measure of the *complexity* of graphs—more precisely, of how close a graph is to a tree. Many classes of graphs have been shown to have bounded tree-width [2]. Over such graphs, several (NP-)hard problems have can be solved efficiently [2]. Parity games are such an example where bounded tree-width makes algorithms more efficient: they have recently been settled in LOGCFL when the underlying graph has bounded tree-width [10].

Dynamic problems and dynamic complexity. In this paper, we focus on the *dynamic complexity* of parity games. Dynamic complexity theory aims at developing algorithms that are capable of efficiently updating the output of a problem after a slight change in its

* This work is supported by EU under ERC EQualIS (FP7-308087) and STREP Casting (FP7-601148).



© Patricia Bouyer, Vincent Jugé and Nicolas Markey;
licensed under Creative Commons License CC-BY

Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics

LIPICs Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, Dagstuhl Publishing, Germany

input [19, 12, 22]. Such algorithms would keep track of auxiliary information about the current instance, and update it efficiently when the instance is modified.

Consider the problem of reachability in directed graphs, and equip such graphs with two operations, for respectively inserting and deleting edges (one at a time). It has recently been proven that this problem is in the class **DynFO** [4], which was a long-standing open problem. Roughly speaking, an algorithm is in **DynFO** when the solution and the auxiliary information can be updated by **FO** formulas (or equivalently, by AC^0 circuits) after a small change in the input. Moreover, since they maintain some amount of auxiliary information, dynamic algorithms can be used to compute and maintain witnesses for the problem they solve—for reachability, it would maintain a path between the source and target nodes, when such a path exists.

Our contributions. We study parity games from a dynamic perspective, considering the following basic operations on graphs: insertion and deletion of an edge, and corruption (change of owner) and change of priority of a vertex. We also assume that we are given a maximal graph, which embeds all constructed game graphs along the dynamic process: this maximal graph represents the set of all possible connections in the game. We first realize that, by the arguments of [19, Corollary 5.7], the parity-game problem over arbitrary maximal graphs is unlikely to be solvable in **DynFO** (unless $\text{DynFO} = \text{PTIME}$). We therefore make a standard restriction and assume that the maximal graph has bounded tree-width. Under this hypothesis, we show that parity games can be solved in **DynFO** with **LOGSPACE** precomputation, that is, we can decide whether a distinguished fixed vertex is winning or not. To obtain this result, we rely on (and extend) a **DynFO** algorithm for finding a Dyck path in an acyclic automaton [22], and build a transformation of our parity-game problem into such a Dyck-path problem. The latter transformation is performed by realizing that local views of possible strategies can be computed (simple)-step-by-(simple)-step, thanks to the restriction on the maximal graph. These simple steps can be stored in an auxiliary graph, in which only few edges depend on the real edges that exist in the original game, and the correctness of the construction goes through the search for paths labelled with Dyck words.

By lack of space, this extended abstract only focuses on a simplified framework, where only insertions and deletions of edges are taken into account. In the Appendix, we present the proofs for the general framework, where: (i) we allow further basic operations like the change of the color or of the owner of a vertex; (ii) we maintain a winning strategy from the distinguished vertex (if such a strategy exists), and (iii) we maintain a uniformly winning strategy, that is, a (memoryless) strategy that is winning from every winning vertex of the game. The second point requires maintaining a witness for the Dyck words problem in the built automaton, while the third point requires expanding the automaton for the Dyck-word problem into a non-acyclic automaton.

Related works. Given their central role in theoretical computer science, parity games have been extensively studied in various contexts [24, 14, 5, 9]. This is certainly also due to the fact that the exact complexity of finding the winner in those games remains one of the foremost open problems in the area of games on graphs. Bounding the tree- or clique-width on the underlying graph makes the problem easier: a polynomial-time algorithm was proposed by Obdržálek [18], and later improved until the recent **LOGCFL** algorithm proposed by Ganardi [10].

On the other hand, dynamic complexity is much less developed: while the main dynamic complexity classes were defined and studied 20 years ago [19, 12, 22, 23], only few problems have been considered from that point of view. As cited above, directed-graph reachability has

recently been proven in DynFO, which was an important open problem in the area. However, the complexity of maintaining a witness remains an open problem.

2 Definitions

2.1 Two-player parity games

A graph is a pair $G = (V, E)$ where V is a finite set of vertices, and $E \subseteq V \times V$ is a finite set of edges. A path in the graph G is a sequence of vertices $\pi = s_0 \cdot s_1 \cdot s_2 \dots$ such that for every $i \geq 0$, $(s_i, s_{i+1}) \in E$. If π is a finite path, we denote by $\text{last}(\pi)$ the last vertex of π .

Let $W \subseteq V$. A W -selector in G is a partial mapping f with domain $\text{dom}(f) \subseteq W$ that associates with every $s \in \text{dom}(f)$ a vertex $s' \in V$ such that $(s, s') \in E$. A path $\pi = s_0 \cdot s_1 \cdot s_2 \dots$ is called compatible with f whenever $s_i \in \text{dom}(f)$ implies $s_{i+1} = f(s_i)$. A maximal such path will be called an *outcome* of f .

A two-player (turn-based) *parity game* is a tuple $G = (V, E, c, V_0, V_1)$, where (V, E) is a graph, $c: V \mapsto \mathbb{N}$ is a coloring function, $V_0 \subseteq V$ is the set of those vertices that are controlled by P_0 , and $V_1 = V \setminus V_0$ is the set of those vertices that are controlled by P_1 .

A *strategy* for player P_p ($p \in \{0, 1\}$) is then a mapping σ_p that associates, with every finite path π such that $\text{last}(\pi) \in V_p$, a vertex s' such that $(\text{last}(\pi), s') \in E$, if any. The strategy σ_p is called *memoryless* whenever there is a V_p -selector f_p such that, for every finite path π , $\sigma_p(\pi) = f_p(\text{last}(\pi))$. A path $\pi = s_0 \cdot s_1 \cdot s_2 \dots$ is said to be compatible with σ_p whenever $s_0 \dots s_j \in \text{dom}(\sigma_p)$ implies $s_{j+1} = \sigma_p(s_0 \dots s_j)$. A maximal compatible path is called an outcome of σ_p .

A finite path $\pi = s_0 \cdot s_1 \cdot s_2 \dots s_k$ is winning for player P_p if $\text{last}(\pi) \in V_{1-p}$; otherwise it is losing for player P_p . An infinite path $\pi = s_0 \cdot s_1 \cdot s_2 \dots$ is winning for player P_p whenever $\limsup_{i \geq 0} c(v_i) \equiv p \pmod{2}$: P_0 wins if the maximal color encountered infinitely many times is even, and P_1 wins otherwise. Let $s_0 \in V$ be an initial vertex. A strategy σ_p for player P_p is called winning at s_0 if every maximal outcome starting at s_0 is winning for player P_p .

Two-player parity games belong to the Borel hierarchy, hence they are known for having *uniform memoryless strategies* [6]. More precisely, the set V of vertices can be split into two subsets W_0 and W_1 in such a way that each player P_p has a memoryless winning strategy f_p , such that, if the play starts in some vertex $v \in W_p$, then player P_p can ensure winning by following the strategy f_p , no matter what her adversary plays: we say that σ_p is an *optimal* strategy for P_p , and that the corresponding V_p -selector f_p is optimal.

The standard static questions regarding parity games are to decide whether player P_0 has a winning strategy from a distinguished vertex, and to compute a witnessing winning strategy; or more generally to compute the set of winning states W_0 , and a uniform optimal winning strategy for player P_0 . Characterizing the exact complexity of these problems is a well-known open problem: it is known that the decision problem is in $\text{NP} \cap \text{coNP}$ [6] and PTIME-hard, but it is not known whether it belongs to PTIME.

2.2 Tree decomposition

The notion of *tree decomposition* [20, 21] was introduced by Robertson and Seymour in order to extract classes of graphs on which problems that are NP-hard in general might be tractable. A tree decomposition of a graph $G = (V, E)$ is a pair $\mathcal{D} = (\mathcal{T}, \mathbf{T})$, where $\mathcal{T} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ is an undirected tree, and $\mathbf{T}: \mathcal{V} \mapsto 2^V$ is a function such that:

- (i) for each edge $(s, t) \in E$, there exists a node $v \in \mathcal{V}$ such that $\{s, t\} \subseteq \mathbf{T}(v)$;
- (ii) for each $s \in V$, the set $\mathcal{V}_s = \{v \in \mathcal{V} \mid s \in \mathbf{T}(v)\}$ is a non-empty connected subset of $\mathcal{T}$.

The *width* of $\mathcal{D}$ is defined as the integer $\max\{|\mathbf{T}(v)| \mid v \in \mathcal{V}\} - 1$, and the *tree-width* of G is the least width of all tree decompositions of G .

2.3 Dynamic complexity classes

Our aim in this paper is to tackle parity games with a dynamic-complexity viewpoint. We briefly introduce the formalisms of descriptive- and dynamic complexity here, and refer to [13, 19, 11] for more details.

Descriptive complexity aims at characterizing positive instances of a problem using logical formulas: the input is then described as a logical structure described by a set of k -ary predicates (the *vocabulary*) over its universe. For example, a directed graph can be described by a binary predicate representing its edges, with the set of states (usually identified to $[1; n]$ for some n) as the universe. The problem of deciding whether each state has at most one outgoing edge can be described by the first-order formula $\forall x, y, z. (E(x, y) \wedge E(x, z)) \Rightarrow (y = z)$. The class FO contains all problems that can be characterized by such first-order formulas. This class corresponds to the circuit-complexity class AC^0 (under adequate reductions) [1].

Dynamic complexity aims at developing algorithms that can efficiently update the output of a problem when the input is slightly changed, for example reachability of one vertex from another one in a graph. We would like our algorithm to take advantage of previous computations in order to very quickly decide the existence of a path in the modified graph.

Formally, a decision problem S is a subset of the set of τ -structures $\text{Struct}(\tau)$ built on a vocabulary τ . In order to turn S into a dynamic problem $\text{Dyn}S$, we need to define a finite set of initial inputs and a finite set of allowed updates. For instance, we might use an arbitrary graph as initial input, then use a 2-ary operator $\text{ins}(x, y)$ that would insert an edge between nodes x and y . For a universe of size n , the set of initial inputs forms a finite alphabet, denoted by Ξ_n , and the set of update operations forms a finite alphabet, denoted by Σ_n . A finite, non-empty word in $\Xi_n \cdot \Sigma_n^*$ then corresponds to a structure obtained by applying a sequence of update operations of Σ_n to an initial structure in Ξ_n . The language $\text{Dyn}S_n$ is defined as the set of those words in $\Xi_n \cdot \Sigma_n^*$ that correspond to structures of S , and $\text{Dyn}S$ is the union (over all n) of all such languages.

A dynamic machine is a uniform family $(M_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of deterministic finite automata $M_n = \langle Q_n, \Xi_n, \Sigma_n, \delta_n^{\text{init}}, \delta_n^{\text{up}}, s_n, F_n \rangle$ over initial alphabet Ξ_n and update alphabet Σ_n , with one initial transition function δ_n^{init} (used when reading the first letter) and one update transition function δ_n^{up} (used when reading the subsequent letters). The set of states can be encoded as a structure over some vocabulary τ^{aux} , and corresponds to a polynomial-size auxiliary data structure. Such a machine solves a dynamic problem if $\text{Dyn}S_n = \mathcal{L}(M_n)$ for all n . It is in the dynamic complexity class $\mathcal{C}'\text{-Dyn}\mathcal{C}$ (or simply $\text{Dyn}\mathcal{C}$ if $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}'$) if the update transition function and accepting set can be computed in $\mathcal{C}$, while the initial state and initial transition function can be computed in $\mathcal{C}'$. In other words, solving any initial instance of the problem (specified as an element of Ξ_n) can be done in $\mathcal{C}'$, and after any update of the input (specified by some letter of Σ_n), further calculations to solve the problem on that new instance are restricted to the class $\mathcal{C}$. Of course, for the a dynamic complexity class $\mathcal{C}'\text{-Dyn}\mathcal{C}$ to have some interest, the class $\mathcal{C}$ should be easier than the static complexity class of the original problem.

In this paper, we only consider the case where $\mathcal{C} = \text{FO}$, meaning that first-order formulas will be used to describe how predicates are updated along transitions.

2.4 Main result

We are now in a position to formally define our problem and state our main result. We fix a positive integer $\mathbf{C}$. We follow the approach of [5] and assume that parity games are represented as relational structures $\langle V, E, C_1, \dots, C_{\mathbf{C}}, V_0, V_1 \rangle$, where $V = V_0 \uplus V_1 = \bigsqcup_{1 \leq j \leq \mathbf{C}} C_j$, with disjoint sets V_0 and V_1 and pairwise-disjoint sets $(C_j)_{1 \leq j \leq \mathbf{C}}$. Given a universe $\bar{V}$, our initial input then consists in a tuple $(\sigma, \mathcal{V}, \mathcal{C}, E_*)$ where $\sigma \in V$ is an initial state of the game, $\mathcal{V} = (V_0, V_1)$ and $\mathcal{C} = (C_1, \dots, C_{\mathbf{C}})$ are partitions of the state set V , and $E_* \subseteq V^2$ is a maximal set of edges (they are all given by predicates over universe V).

In this extended abstract, we only focus on the operations of insertion and deletion of edges that belong to E_* . More precisely, we let $\Sigma_{E_*} = \{\text{ins}(x, y), \text{del}(x, y) \mid (x, y) \in E_*\}$. The effect of a sequence of update operations, represented as a word $w \in \Sigma_{E_*}^*$, over a set $E \subseteq V^2$ of edges, is denoted with $w(E)$, and is defined inductively as:

$$\begin{array}{llll} E & \text{if } w = \epsilon & E \cup \{(x, y)\} & \text{if } w = \text{ins}(x, y) \\ w'(a(E)) & \text{if } w = w' \cdot a & E \setminus \{(x, y)\} & \text{if } w = \text{del}(x, y) \end{array}$$

For $w \in \Sigma_{E_*}^*$, we write G_w for the graph with edge set $w(\emptyset)$ (in particular, G_ϵ is the edgeless graph) or, by abuse of notation, for the parity game $\langle V, w(\emptyset), C_1, \dots, C_{\mathbf{C}}, V_0, V_1 \rangle$. It is to be noted that G_w is a subgraph of (V, E_*) . Finally, we let

$$\text{DynParity}_{\mathbf{C}} = \{(\sigma, \mathcal{V}, \mathcal{C}, E_*) \cdot w \mid w \in \Sigma_{E_*}^*, \text{ Player } P_0 \text{ wins from } \sigma \text{ in } G_w\}.$$

As mentioned in the introduction, applying arguments of [19, Corollary 5.7], it is unlikely that the above problem be solvable in PTIME-DynFO (taking $E_* = V^2$), even with only two colors. We therefore adopt the idea of bounding the tree-width of graph (V, E_*) . In addition to fixing $\mathbf{C}$, we also fix a positive integer κ and we restrict the set of admissible initial inputs: the graph (V, E_*) should be of tree-width at most κ . Hence we restrict the above problem as follows:

$$\text{DynParity}_{\mathbf{C}, \kappa} = \{(\sigma, \mathcal{V}, \mathcal{C}, E_*) \cdot w \mid (V, E_*) \text{ has tree-width at most } \kappa\} \cap \text{DynParity}_{\mathbf{C}}.$$

Then we design a dynamic algorithm for deciding $\text{DynParity}_{\mathbf{C}, \kappa}$, taking as initial graph instance the edgeless graph. Additionally, our algorithm maintains information to output a winning strategy for player P_0 when such a strategy exists:

► **Theorem 1.** *Fix positive integers $\mathbf{C}$ and κ . The problem $\text{DynParity}_{\mathbf{C}, \kappa}$ can be solved in LOGSPACE-DynFO.*

We give a short overview of the proof here. Our algorithm consists in transforming our parity-game problem into an equivalent Dyck-path problem over a labelled acyclic graph. The latter problem is known to be in DynFO [22] (but we had to adapt the algorithm to our setting). Our approach for building this acyclic graph benefits from ideas of [18]: along some linearization of a tree decomposition of the maximal graph, we can compute inductively local information about the effects of strategies. These computations can be represented as finding a path in an acyclic graph. However, we have to resort to *Dyck paths* in order to make our acyclic graph efficiently updatable when the parity game is modified.

3 Precomputation: nice tree decompositions and depth-first traversals

Before looking into parity games themselves, we introduce a special kind of rooted tree decomposition, called *nice decomposition* [16].

► **Definition 2.** Let $\mathcal{D} = (\mathcal{T}, \mathbf{T})$ be a tree decomposition of a graph $G = (V, E)$, with $\mathcal{T} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$. We say that the tree decomposition $\mathcal{D}$ is *nice* if:

- for all $s \in V$, there exists a node v_s of $\mathcal{T}$ such that $\mathbf{T}(v_s) = \{s\}$;
- for all leaves v of $\mathcal{T}$, there exists a vertex $s \in V$ such that $v = v_s$;
- for all edges (v, w) of $\mathcal{T}$, either $|\mathbf{T}(v)| = |\mathbf{T}(w)| + 1$ and $\mathbf{T}(v) \supseteq \mathbf{T}(w)$ or $|\mathbf{T}(v)| + 1 = |\mathbf{T}(w)|$ and $\mathbf{T}(w) \subseteq \mathbf{T}(v)$.

In addition, for all vertices $s \in V$, we abusively say that $\mathcal{D}$ is *rooted at s* if we root the tree $\mathcal{T}$ at the node v_s .

Nice decompositions ensure very small changes between adjacent nodes of the tree, which is somehow required in a dynamic-complexity perspective.

Extending [7], one can show the following (see Appendix B):

► **Lemma 3.** *Let G be a graph with n vertices and with tree-width κ . We can construct in LOGSPACE a nice tree decomposition $(\mathcal{T}, \mathbf{T})$ of G , with width at most $4\kappa + 3$ and diameter at most $c(\kappa) \cdot (\log_2(n) + 1)$, where $c(\kappa)$ only depends on κ .*

However, we will not use nice tree decompositions directly. Instead, we first need to perform *depth-first traversals* of such decompositions.

► **Definition 4.** Let $\mathcal{T}$ be a rooted tree, with root ρ . For each vertex v of $\mathcal{T}$, we denote by $\mathcal{A}(v)$ the set of ancestors of v in $\mathcal{T}$, including v itself. A *depth-first traversal* of $\mathcal{T}$ is a sequence $v_1, \dots, v_\ell$ of vertices of $\mathcal{T}$ such that

- $v_1 = v_\ell = \rho$;
- all vertices of $\mathcal{T}$ belong to the set $\{v_1, \dots, v_\ell\}$;
- for all $i \leq \ell - 1$, v_{i+1} is either a child or a parent of v_i ;
- for all $x \leq y \leq z \leq \ell$, we have $\mathcal{A}(x) \cap \mathcal{A}(z) \subseteq \mathcal{A}(y)$.


Performing a depth-first traversal on a rooted tree-decomposition of a graph G is a standard construction of a *linear decomposition* of G , i.e., a degenerate rooted tree decomposition of G in which every internal node has one unique child [21]. More precisely, the sequence $(\mathcal{A}(v_i))_{1 \leq i \leq \ell}$ is a linear decomposition of $\mathcal{T}$, from which a linear decomposition of G is easily derived. However, in the sequel, we do *not* focus on the latter linear decomposition, but rather on a nice tree-decomposition $\mathcal{T}$ of G and on a depth-first traversal of $\mathcal{T}$ itself.

These constructions are illustrated in Fig. 1, which displays a graph G , a nice tree decomposition $(\mathcal{T}, \mathbf{T})$ of G , and depth-first traversal of $\mathcal{T}$.


4 Towards a dynamic algorithm: selector views

In this section, we fix an input game G and we assume that we have a nice tree decomposition $\mathcal{D} = (\mathcal{T}, \mathbf{T})$ of G such as constructed in Lemma 3, rooted at a vertex σ of G , and that we have a depth-first traversal $v_1, \dots, v_\ell$ of $\mathcal{T}$. We transform our parity-game problem into a Dyck-path problem. More precisely, we build a graph Γ_G , and establish a correspondence between some Dyck paths in this graph and winning strategies in the original game.

Moreover, in order to simplify subsequent proofs, and without loss of generality, we assume from this point on that G contains at least two vertices.



■ **Figure 1** Graph, nice tree decomposition and depth-first traversal



■ **Figure 2** Sets $\Theta_{>i}(v)$ and $\Psi_{>i}(v)$

■ **Figure 3** Selector views $f_i(v)$ of a V -selector f

4.1 Selector views

For all nodes v of $\mathcal{T}$, recall that $\mathcal{A}(v)$ is the set of ancestors of v . For all integers $i \in [1, \ell]$, we define the sets $\Theta_i = \mathcal{A}(v_i)$ and $\Psi_i = \bigcup_{v \in \Theta_i} \mathbf{T}(v)$. Then, for all $i \in [0, \ell]$, we also set

$$\Theta_{\leq i} = \bigcup_{j=1}^i \Theta_j \quad \Theta_{> i} = \mathcal{V} \setminus \Theta_{\leq i} \quad \Psi_{\leq i} = \bigcup_{j=1}^i \Psi_j \quad \Psi_{> i} = \mathcal{V} \setminus \Psi_{\leq i}$$

Observe that $\Psi_{\leq 0} = \Psi_{> \ell} = \emptyset$ and that $\Psi_{\leq 1} = \mathbf{T}(v_1) = \{\sigma\}$.

By definition, for all $1 \leq i \leq \ell$, the sets Θ_i and $\Theta_{\leq i}$ are non-empty and ancestor-closed. Therefore, each node $w \in \Theta_{> i-1}$ has a unique lowest ancestor in $\Theta_{\leq i}$, which we denote by $n_i(w)$. Let $a \leq i$ and $b \geq i$ be integers such that $n_i(w) \in \Theta_a = \mathcal{A}(v_a)$ and that $w = v_b$. Thus $n_i(w)$ appears in both $\mathcal{A}(v_a)$ and $\mathcal{A}(v_b)$, which entails that $n_i(w) \in \mathcal{A}(v_i) = \Theta_i$.

Furthermore, for each vertex $s \in V$, we let $\mathcal{T}^s = \{v \in \mathcal{V} \mid s \in \mathbf{T}(v)\}$. Denoting by $r(s)$ the root of the sub-tree $\mathcal{T}^s$ of $\mathcal{T}$, we know that $s \in \Psi_{> i-1}$ if, and only if, $r(s) \in \Theta_{> i-1}$; in that case, we also denote by $n_i(s)$ the node $n_i(r(s))$, and it is easy to see that $n_i(v) = n_i(s)$ for all nodes $v \in \mathcal{T}^s$.

In what follows, for all nodes $v \in \Theta_i$, we denote by $\Theta_{> i-1}(v)$, $\Psi_{> i-1}(v)$ the sets $\{w \in \Theta_{> i-1} \mid n_i(w) = v\}$ and $\{s \in \Psi_{> i-1} \mid n_i(s) = v\}$, which respectively form partitions (possibly containing empty sets) of the sets $\Theta_{> i-1}$ and $\Psi_{> i-1}$. Then every edge of G with one end s in $\Psi_{> i-1}(v)$ has its other end in $\Psi_{> i-1}(v) \cup \mathbf{T}(v)$, since $\Theta_{> i-1}(v) \cup \{v\}$ is a subtree of $\mathcal{T}$ that contains $\mathcal{T}^s$. Figure 2 shows some sets $\Theta_{>i}(v)$ and $\Psi_{>i}(v)$ obtained from the depth-first traversal of Figure 1.

It is worth noting that $\Psi_{>i}(\cdot)$ only slightly differs from $\Psi_{>i+1}(\cdot)$. This will allow us to propagate useful information on V -selectors in a backward manner, from $\Psi_{>\ell}$ to $\Psi_{>0}$. In order to define the information we need about V -selectors, we introduce three new symbols $?$, $\top$ and $\perp$, and for every node $v \in \mathcal{V}$, we denote by $\Lambda(v)$ the set of functions $\mathbf{T}(v) \rightarrow \{?, \top, \perp\} \cup (\mathbf{T}(v) \times \{1, \dots, \mathbf{C}\})$. With every V -selector f , every index $1 \leq i \leq \ell$, and every node $v \in \Theta_i$, we associate such a function, which encodes local information about the behavior of f on $\Psi_{>i-1}(v)$. We make it explicit now.

► **Definition 5.** Consider an integer $1 \leq i \leq \ell$, a node $v \in \Theta_i$, a vertex $s \in \mathbf{T}(v)$ and a V -selector f . Let $\pi = s \cdot s_1 \cdot s_2 \dots$ be the unique (maximal) outcome of f from s .

We call *selector view*, and denote by $f_i(v, s)$, the element of $\{?, \top, \perp\} \cup (\mathbf{T}(v) \times \{1, \dots, \mathbf{C}\})$ defined as follows:

- if π stays in $\Psi_{>i-1}(v)$ after the first step (or if $s \in \Psi_{>i-1}(v) \setminus \text{dom}(f)$) and is winning for P_0 , then $f_i(v, s) = \top$;
- if π stays in $\Psi_{>i-1}(v)$ after the first step (or if $s \in \Psi_{>i-1}(v) \setminus \text{dom}(f)$) and is losing for P_0 , then $f_i(v, s) = \perp$;
- if the first step of π does not enter $\Psi_{>i-1}(v)$ (or if $s \notin \Psi_{>i-1}(v)$ and $s \notin \text{dom}(f)$), then $f_i(v, s) = ?$;
- if π stays in $\Psi_{>i-1}(v)$ from the first step until some step $j \geq 2$, and c_m is the maximal color seen along π between s and s_{j-1} , then $f_i(v, s) = (s_j, c_m)$.

By extension, we also call selector views the functions $f_i(v) : s \mapsto f_i(v, s)$.

Figure 3 displays examples of selector views. The V -selector f is represented by solid edges, and dotted edges are those graph edges that are not used by f . The color $c(s_i)$ of each vertex $s_i \in V$ is indicated on the right.

We explain in the next section how those views can be computed iteratively by efficient local operations. We then proceed in the same way with V_0 -strategies (which we target); this will provide us with a graph in which a simple Dyck-path query will answer our problem.

4.2 Computing selector views

We aim at computing the sequence of selector views $(f_i)_{1 \leq i \leq \ell}$ in a backward manner, computing $(f_i(v))_{v \in \Theta_i}$ from $(f_{i+1}(v))_{v \in \Theta_{i+1}}$. However, knowing the latter views is not sufficient for reconstructing the former ones: intuitively speaking, the functions $f_{i+1}(v)$ provide us with knowledge about the behavior of f in each domain $\Psi_{>i}(v)$, i.e. in $\Psi_{>i}$, and we need to get information on how f behaves on $\Psi_{>i-1}$. When $\Psi_{>i}$ is a strict subset of $\Psi_{>i-1}$, we need some additional information, as we explain now.

Fix an index i ($1 \leq i \leq \ell$) such that $\Psi_{>i} \subsetneq \Psi_{>i-1}$. Such an index i is said to be *critical*. It corresponds to steps of the depth-first traversal where a new node is being explored. More precisely, this means that the node v_i is a child of v_{i-1} (or that $i = 1$) and that there exists a (necessarily unique) vertex θ_i of G such that $v_i = r(\theta_i)$. Then, we have $\Psi_{>i-1} = \Psi_{>i} \uplus \{\theta_i\}$.

Consequently, in order to know “how f behaves on $\Psi_{>i-1}$ ”, we need to identify which vertex $s \in \mathbf{T}(v_i)$, if any, is such that $f(\theta_i) = s$, and which vertices $t \in \mathbf{T}(v_i)$ are such that $f(t) = \theta_i$.

One can show the following result, whose proof is postponed to Appendix C.1:

► **Proposition 6.** Fix a V -selector f . For all integers $i \leq \ell$, it holds:

- if $i = \ell$, then f_i is FO-definable;
- if $i \leq \ell - 1$ is non-critical, then f_i is FO-definable using f_{i+1} ;

- if $i \leq \ell - 1$ is critical, then f_i is FO-definable using f_{i+1} and a predicate that indicates which vertices $s \in \mathbf{T}(v_i)$ are such that $f(\theta_i) = s$, and which vertices $t \in \mathbf{T}(v_i)$ are such that $f(t) = \theta_i$.

The correctness of the approach is then straightforward:

► **Lemma 7.** *Let σ be the vertex of G at which the nice tree decomposition $\mathcal{T}$ is rooted: we have $\Theta_1 = \{v_1\}$ and $\mathbf{T}(v_1) = \{\sigma\}$. Furthermore, let $\pi = \sigma \cdot s_1 \cdot s_2 \dots$ be the unique (maximal) outcome of f from σ . Then (a) $f_1(v_1, \sigma) \in \{\perp, \top\}$; and (b) π is winning for P_0 if, and only if, $f_1(v_1, \sigma) = \top$.*

4.3 Views of V_0 -selectors

Let g be a V_0 -selector and let f be a V -selector. We say that f is an *extension* of g if g is the restriction of f to the domain V_0 . For all i , we would like to compute set $\{f_i \mid f \text{ is an extension of } g\}$. One may wish to view each set as a subset of $\prod_{v \in \Theta_i} \Lambda(v)$. Unfortunately, this latter set may be polynomially large, since $\Theta_i = \mathcal{A}(v_i)$ may have size up to $c(\kappa)(\log_2(n) + 1)$. Hence, no FO formula with domain V and with a given arity can distinguish all the subsets of $\prod_{v \in \Theta_i} \Lambda(v)$ when n grows, and we shall use a less direct approach.

We over-approximate those sets by projecting over every $v \in \Theta_i$ as follows. Let $\Lambda_i = \prod_{v \in \Theta_i} 2^{\Lambda(v)}$. We call *selector view* of the V_0 -selector g , and denote by ω_i^g , the element of Λ_i defined by: $\omega_i^g : v \mapsto \{f_i(v) \mid f \text{ is an extension of } g\}$. Since every set $\Lambda(v)$ has a size at most $(3 + 4(\kappa + 1)\mathbf{C})^{4(\kappa+1)}$ and since $|\Theta_i| \leq c(\kappa) \cdot (\log_2(n) + 1)$, the cardinality of Λ_i is polynomial in n .

We then argue that selector views of V_0 -selectors are sufficient for deciding whether the vertex σ is winning for P_0 , and that they can be computed in a backward manner by FO formulas.

► **Lemma 8.** *The vertex σ is winning for P_0 if, and only if, there exists a V_0 -selector g such that $\omega_1^g(v_1)$ is the singleton set $\{\sigma \mapsto \top\}$.*

Moreover, for all V -selectors f , the collection $(f_i(v))_{v \in \Theta_i}$ satisfies the following *compatibility* requirement:

$$\forall v, w \in \Theta_i. [(v \neq w) \Rightarrow \forall s \in \mathbf{T}(v) \cap \mathbf{T}(w). ? \in \{f_i(v, s), f_i(w, s)\}].$$

This is because $\Psi_{>i}(v) \cap \Psi_{>i}(w) = \emptyset$. We therefore denote by $\mathcal{C}^0$ the set of those tuples $(\varphi_v)_{v \in X}$ with $X \subseteq \mathcal{T}$ and $\varphi_v \in \Lambda(v)$ for all $v \in X$, such that for all nodes $v, w \in X$, if $v \neq w$, then for every $s \in \mathbf{T}(v) \cap \mathbf{T}(w)$, $? \in \{\varphi_v(s), \varphi_w(s)\}$. For all V_0 -selectors g , the selector views ω_i^g enjoy a similar compatibility requirement.

► **Lemma 9.** *Let g be a V_0 -selector, and let X be a subset of Θ_i . For every tuple $(\varphi_v)_{v \in X}$ in $\mathcal{C}^0 \cap \prod_{v \in X} \omega_i^g(v)$, there exists an extension f of g such that $\varphi_v = f_i(v)$ for all nodes $v \in X$.*

Thanks to Lemma 9, Proposition 6 leads to a similar result for V_0 -selectors, whose proof is given in Appendix C.2.

► **Proposition 10.** *Fix a V_0 -selector g . For all integers $i \leq \ell$, there exists a FO-definable function Ω_i such that:*

- if $i = \ell$, then Ω_i is a constant, and $\omega_i^g = \Omega_i$;
- if $i \leq \ell - 1$ is non-critical, then $\omega_i^g = \Omega_i(\omega_{i+1}^g)$;

- if $i \leq \ell - 1$ is critical, then $\omega_i^g = \Omega_i(\omega_{i+1}^g, (\mathbf{B}_{\theta_i, s})_{s \in \mathbf{T}(v_i)}, (\mathbf{B}'_{s, \theta_i})_{s \in \mathbf{T}(v_i)})$, where $(\mathbf{B}_{\theta_i, s})_{s \in \mathbf{T}(v_i)}$ and $(\mathbf{B}'_{s, \theta_i})_{s \in \mathbf{T}(v_i)}$ are vectors whose entries are defined by:

$$\mathbf{B}'_{x, y} = \mathbf{B}_{x, y} = \begin{cases} \{\perp\} & \text{if } (x, y) \notin E, \text{ or } x \in V_0 \setminus \text{dom}(g), \\ & \text{or } x \in \text{dom}(g) \text{ and } g(x) \neq y \\ \{\top\} & \text{if } x \in \text{dom}(g) \text{ and } g(x) = y \\ \{\perp, \top\} & \text{if } (x, y) \in E \text{ and } x \notin V_0 \end{cases}$$

4.4 Reduction to the Dyck problem

In this section, we present the reduction of $\text{DynParity}_{\mathbf{C}, \kappa}$ to a Dyck-path problem on an acyclic labelled graph. Our reduction is such that any update (of the edges) in the parity game corresponds to a simple update of the acyclic graph. As we explain in the next section, this reduction will prove Theorem 1.

Our proof is built on a transformation of the graph G of the parity game into an acyclic labelled graph Γ_G for the Dyck-path problem. This construction takes advantage of the iterative computation of the selector views: most of the computation of ω_i^g depends only of ω_{i+1}^g , and only few steps (for critical indices $i \leq \ell - 1$) of the computation actually directly depend on g itself.

A “nominal” vertex of graph Γ_G is a pair (i, Z) , where $Z \in \Lambda_i$ stores the possible values for ω_i^g (with g ranging over the set of V_0 -selectors).

Using Proposition 10, for all non-critical values of $i \leq \ell - 1$, the value of ω_i^g can be computed from only ω_{i+1}^g (for every g). Hence we add “neutral” edges, labelled with $\bullet$ (those are labels that will not need to be well-balanced in Dyck paths):

$$(i + 1, Z) \xrightarrow{\bullet} (i, Z') \text{ where } Z' = \Omega_i(Z).$$

Note that these transitions always exist, whatever the set of edges in G . In particular, they have to be precomputed, and are not affected by insertions or deletions of edges in G .

Now, if $i \leq \ell - 1$ is critical, we have to abstract the choice of g , and to give all possible options in the graph Γ_G . For $x, y \in V$, let $\text{choice}(x, y)$ be defined as follows:

$$\text{choice}(x, y) = \begin{cases} \{\{\perp\}\} & \text{if } (x, y) \notin E \\ \{\{\perp\}, \{\top\}\} & \text{if } (x, y) \in E \text{ and } x \in V_0 \\ \{\{\perp, \top\}\} & \text{if } (x, y) \in E \text{ and } x \in V_1 \end{cases}$$

This represents the possible options of player P_0 from state x : in the first case, edge (x, y) is not available; in the second case, edge (x, y) exists in G , and player P_0 can decide to take it or not; in the last case, player P_0 should take both possibilities into account.

The natural way of building Γ_G would consist in adding neutral edges $(i, Z) \xrightarrow{\bullet} (i, Z')$ for all “relevant” vectors $\mathbf{B}$ and $\mathbf{B}'$, with $Z' = \Omega_i(Z, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{B}')$. However, this would require too many changes in Γ_G when an edge is updated in G . Instead, we split such an edge into several edges, and consider Dyck paths instead.

Let us say that a pair of vectors $(\mathbf{B}_{\theta_i, s})_{s \in \mathbf{T}(v_i)}$ and $(\mathbf{B}'_{s, \theta_i})_{s \in \mathbf{T}(v_i)}$ is *suitable at step i* if their entries are non-empty subsets of $\{\perp, \top\}$. The graph Γ_G additionally contains the following edges and vertices:

- $(i + 1, Z) \xrightarrow{i, Z} (i, 0)$ for all $Z \in \Lambda_i$;
- $(i, 0) \xrightarrow{i, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{B}'} (i, 1)$ for all vectors $\mathbf{B}$ and $\mathbf{B}'$ suitable at step i and with entries $\mathbf{B}'_{x, y}, \mathbf{B}_{x, y} \in \text{choice}(x, y)$;

- $(i, 1) \xrightarrow{\overline{i, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{B}'}} (i, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{B}')$ for all vectors $\mathbf{B}$ and $\mathbf{B}'$ suitable at step i ;
- $(i, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{B}') \xrightarrow{\overline{i, Z}} (i, Z')$ where $Z' = \Omega_i(Z, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{B}')$, for all $Z \in \Lambda_i$ and for all vectors $\mathbf{B}$ and $\mathbf{B}'$ suitable at step i .

Observe that every path of the form $(i + 1, Z) \xrightarrow{\bullet} (i, Z')$ or

$$(i + 1, Z) \xrightarrow{\overline{i, Z}} (i, 0) \xrightarrow{i, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{B}'} (i, 1) \xrightarrow{\overline{i, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{B}'}} (i, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{B}') \xrightarrow{\overline{i, Z}} (i, Z')$$

is a Dyck path in Γ_G : we call such a path a *nominal Dyck path*. Then, due to the layered structure of the graph Γ_G , every Dyck path in Γ_G is either a sub-path of a nominal Dyck path (i.e., an empty path or a 2-step-long path of the form $(i, 0) \xrightarrow{i, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{B}'} (i, 1) \xrightarrow{\overline{i, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{B}'}} (i, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{B}')$) or a concatenation of nominal Dyck paths; in the latter case, we call the path a *generic Dyck path*.

Finally, we notice that insertion and deletion of an edge (x, y) in G can be quickly propagated in Γ_G : such changes only affect the edges $(i, 0) \xrightarrow{i, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{B}'} (i, 1)$ when $x = \theta_i$ and $y \in \mathbf{T}(v_i)$, or $y = \theta_i$ and $x \in \mathbf{T}(v_i)$ (where $\mathbf{B}$ and $\mathbf{B}'$ are then given by the choice function). They can easily be performed in FO.

We focus now on the subclass $\mathcal{P}_\Gamma$ of generic Dyck paths in Γ_G with source (ℓ, Ω_ℓ) and with sink in $\{(1, Z) \mid Z \subseteq \Lambda(v_1)\}$. For each path $\pi \in \mathcal{P}_\Gamma$, we let

- $Z(\pi)$ be the subset of $\Lambda(v_1)$ such that $(1, Z(\pi))$ is the sink of π ;
- $E(\pi)$ be the subset of E defined as

$$E(\pi) = \left\{ (\theta_i, s) \mid \begin{array}{l} i \text{ is critical, } \theta_i \in V_0, s \in \mathbf{T}(v_i) \text{ and} \\ \pi \text{ goes through a vertex } (i, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{B}') \text{ with } \mathbf{B}_{\theta_i, s} = \{\top\} \end{array} \right\} \cup \left\{ (s, \theta_i) \mid \begin{array}{l} i \text{ is critical, } s \in V_0 \cap \mathbf{T}(v_i) \text{ and} \\ \pi \text{ goes through a vertex } (i, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{B}') \text{ with } \mathbf{B}'_{s, \theta_i} = \{\top\} \end{array} \right\}.$$

The correctness of the reduction follows from the construction in Section 4.3.

► **Proposition 11.** *For every V_0 -selector g in G , there exists a unique Dyck path $\pi^g \in \mathcal{P}_\Gamma$ such that $E(\pi^g) = \{(s, g(s)) \mid s \in \text{dom}(g)\}$. The function $g \mapsto \pi^g$ is a bijection from the set of V_0 -selectors to $\mathcal{P}_\Gamma$. Moreover, we have $Z(\pi^g) = \omega_i^g$, i.e. g ensures P_0 's victory when the play is in σ if, and only if, $Z(\pi^g) = \{\sigma \mapsto \top\}$.*

Consequently, answering our parity-game problem amounts to checking if there exists a Dyck path $\pi \in \mathcal{P}_\Gamma$ such that $Z(\pi) = \{\sigma \mapsto \top\}$. A DynFO algorithm has been proposed for this problem in [22] in the case of two-letter alphabets; extending it to alphabets of polynomial size, as is required here, is straightforward.

5 Overall complexity analysis

In this section, we analyze the complexity of our dynamic algorithm. It is worth noticing that our transformation above is not a *bfo-reduction* in the sense of [19, 12]: the “easy” (edgeless) instances of the parity-game problem are not mapped to the “easy” instances of the Dyck-path problem. In order to accommodate with this, our precomputation phase also has to compute the auxiliary information for the Dyck-path algorithm in the image of the edgeless game. As we explain in Appendix D, this can be achieved in LOGSPACE.

In the end, during the precomputation phase, the algorithm computes:

- a nice tree decomposition $\mathcal{D} = (\mathcal{T}, \mathbf{T})$ of the maximal graph (V, E_*) , rooted at σ , and a depth-first traversal of $\mathcal{T}$;
- the vertices and edges of the graph Γ_{G_ϵ} , where G_ϵ is the edgeless graph $(V, \emptyset, c, V_0, V_1)$;
- useful predicates over the graph Γ_{G_ϵ} , in order to set up our dynamic algorithm for solving the Dyck reachability problem.

During the update phases, whenever introducing or deleting an edge e in G , we have to delete and introduce edges of the form $(i, 0) \xrightarrow{i, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{B}'} (i, 1)$ in Γ_G , for a given index i that depends on e . A constant (independent of e) number of such edges is concerned, and, as mentioned in Section 4.4, these edges are identified by FO formulas taking the edge e into account. Moreover, since $\mathcal{D}$ is a tree decomposition of the maximal graph (V, E_*) , it remains a tree decomposition of G throughout the entire computation. Consequently, updating the edge-membership predicate of Γ_G and the useful auxiliary predicates can be done with FO formulas since the Dyck reachability problem is in DynFO. Finally, deciding whether σ is winning from these predicates can be done using FO formulas again, which completes the proof of Theorem 1.

6 Conclusion

We have presented in this extended abstract a dynamic algorithm for deciding whether player P_0 is winning from a given state σ of a parity game in which some edges may be added or deleted.

As we explain in Appendices E to I, our algorithm can readily be extended in several directions:

- *non-uniform strategy synthesis*: besides deciding whether a given state is winning for player P_0 , the algorithm also maintains a predicate characterizing a winning strategy, should one exist;
- *uniform winning strategy*: our algorithm also computes the entire set of winning states for player P_0 , as well as a uniform memoryless winning strategy (i.e., a single memoryless strategy that is winning from all the winning states);
- *additional updates*: our algorithm is extended to also handle modifications of the color of a state (within the fixed range $[1, \mathbf{C}]$), or the change of owner of a state.

As a final remark, let us mention that our algorithm can be used for dynamic model checking of a fixed μ -calculus formula over Kripke structures of bounded tree-width: μ -calculus model checking can be expressed as a parity game [8, 3], by considering the product of the structure with the graph of the μ -calculus formula. Assuming that the formula is fixed and that we have a tree decomposition of the input structure, we can build the parity game and a tree decomposition for this game in LOGSPACE. Moreover, any addition and deletion of an edge in the Kripke structure translates to the addition or deletion of a fixed number of edges in the parity game. It follows that dynamic model checking of a fixed μ -calculus formula over bounded-tree-width Kripke structures is in LOGSPACE-DynFO. This can be compared to the DynTC⁰ algorithm of [15] for dynamic model checking of fixed LTL formulas over arbitrary Kripke structures.

References

- 1 David A. Mix Barrington, Neil Immerman, and Howard Straubing. On uniformity within NC¹. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 41(3):274–306, December 1990.

- 2 Hans L. Bodlaender. A tourist guide through treewidth. *Acta Cybernetica*, 11(1-2):1–21, 1993.
- 3 Julian C. Bradfield and Igor Walukiewicz. The mu-calculus and model-checking. In Edmund M. Clarke, Thomas A. Henzinger, and Helmut Veith, editors, *Handbook of Model Checking*. Springer-Verlag, 2016. To appear.
- 4 Samir Datta, Raghav Kulkarni, Anish Mukherjee, Thomas Schwentick, and Thomas Zeume. Reachability is in DynFO. In Magnús M. Halldórsson, Kazuo Iwana, Naoki Kobayashi, and Bettina Speckmann, editors, *Proceedings of the 42nd International Colloquium on Automata, Languages and Programming (ICALP'15) – Part II*, volume 9135 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 159–170. Springer-Verlag, July 2015.
- 5 Anuj Dawar and Erich Grädel. The descriptive complexity of parity games. In Michael Kaminski and Simone Martini, editors, *Proceedings of the 22nd International Workshop on Computer Science Logic (CSL'08)*, volume 5213 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 354–368. Springer-Verlag, September 2008.
- 6 Andrzej Ehrenfeucht and Jan Mycielski. Positional strategies for mean payoff games. *International Journal of Game Theory*, 8(2):109–113, June 1979.
- 7 Michael Elberfeld, Andreas Jakoby, and Till Tantau. Logspace versions of the theorems of Bodlaender and Courcelle. In *Proceedings of the 51st Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS'10)*, pages 143–152. IEEE Comp. Soc. Press, October 2010.
- 8 E. Allen Emerson and Charanjit S. Jutla. Tree automata, mu-calculus and determinacy. In *Proceedings of the 32nd Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS'91)*, pages 368–377. IEEE Comp. Soc. Press, October 1991.
- 9 Oliver Friedmann and Martin Lange. Solving parity games in practice. In Zhiming Liu and Anders P. Ravn, editors, *Proceedings of the 7th International Symposium on Automated Technology for Verification and Analysis (ATVA'09)*, volume 5799 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 182–196. Springer-Verlag, October 2009.
- 10 Moses Ganardi. Parity games of bounded tree- and clique-width. In Andrew Pitts, editor, *Proceedings of the 18th International Conference on Foundations of Software Science and Computation Structure (FoSSaCS'15)*, volume 9034 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 390–404. Springer-Verlag, April 2015.
- 11 William Hesse. *Dynamic Computational Complexity*. PhD thesis, Department of Computer Science, University of Massachusetts at Amherst, USA, September 2003.
- 12 William Hesse and Neil Immerman. Complete problems for dynamic complexity classes. In *Proceedings of the 17th Annual Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (LICS'02)*, pages 313–322. IEEE Comp. Soc. Press, July 2002.
- 13 Neil Immerman. *Descriptive complexity*. Graduate texts in computer science. Springer-Verlag, 1999.
- 14 Marcin Jurdziński. Deciding the winner in parity games is in $UP \cap co-UP$. *Information Processing Letters*, 68(3):119–124, November 1998.
- 15 Detlef Kähler and Thomas Wilke. Program complexity of dynamic LTL model checking. In Matthias Baaz and Johann A. Makowsky, editors, *Proceedings of the 17th International Workshop on Computer Science Logic (CSL'03)*, volume 2803 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 271–284. Springer-Verlag, August 2003.
- 16 Ton Kloks. *Treewidth, Computations and Approximations*, volume 842 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*. Springer-Verlag, 1994.
- 17 Andrzej Mostowski. Games with forbidden positions. Research Report 78, University of Danzig, 1991.
- 18 Jan Obdržálek. Fast mu-calculus model checking when tree-width is bounded. In Warren A. Hunt, Jr and Fabio Somenzi, editors, *Proceedings of the 15th International Conference on*

- Computer Aided Verification (CAV'03)*, volume 2725 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 80–92. Springer-Verlag, July 2003.
- 19 Sushant Patnaik and Neil Immerman. Dyn-FO: A parallel, dynamic complexity class. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 55(2):199–209, October 1997.
 - 20 Neil Robertson and Paul D. Seymour. Graph minors III: Planar tree-width. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, series B*, 86(1):49–64, February 1984.
 - 21 Neil Robertson and Paul D. Seymour. Graph minors II: Algorithmic aspects of tree-width. *Journal of Algorithms*, 7(3):309–322, September 1986.
 - 22 Volker Weber and Thomas Schwentick. Dynamic complexity theory revisited. *Theory of Computing Systems*, 40(4):355–377, June 2007.
 - 23 Thomas Zeume. *Small Dynamic Complexity Classes*. PhD thesis, Dortmund University, Germany, May 2015.
 - 24 Wiesław Zielonka. Infinite games on finitely coloured graphs with applications to automata on infinite trees. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 200(1-2):135–183, June 1998.

— Technical Appendix —

This appendix contains proofs and extensions of the results presented in the main part of our paper:

- Appendix A contains a more precise exposition of dynamic complexity;
- Appendix B contains the proofs of the results of Section 3, concerned with tree decompositions and linear decompositions;
- Appendix C contains the additional material and proofs about selector views;
- Appendix D gives a detailed account of the overall complexity of our algorithm, explaining why it is in LOGSPACE-DynFO;
- Appendix E extends the algorithm of [31] to also maintain the auxiliary information for computing a witnessing Dyck path, should one exist;
- Appendix F defines and studies *accessibility sets*, which will be useful for computing the winning region of parity games;
- Appendix G contains a refined construction of the graph Γ_G , which we query for Dyck paths. The construction uses accessibility sets, in order to be able to compute the winning region and a uniform winning strategy;
- Appendix H extends the complexity results to the framework of Appendices E to G;
- Appendix I explains how our algorithm can be extended to solve the uniform version of our problem, and to take additional update operations into account.

A Dynamic complexity classes

In this section, we briefly introduce the formalism of descriptive complexity, and extension to dynamic complexity. We refer to e.g. [28, 30, 27, 32] for more details.

A *vocabulary* is a tuple $\tau = \langle R_i^{a_i}, c_j \rangle$ of relations and constant symbols. A τ -*structure* is a tuple $\mathcal{S} = \langle |\mathcal{S}|, R_i, c_j \rangle$ where $|\mathcal{S}| = [0; n - 1]$ is the universe of size $n \geq 1$, $R_i \subseteq |\mathcal{S}|^{a_i}$ are relations, and $c_j \in |\mathcal{S}|$ are constants. We write $\mathbf{Struct}_n(\tau)$ for the set of finite structures of size n over vocabulary τ . Any subset $S \subseteq \mathbf{Struct}_n(\tau)$ defines a static decision problem, where the aim is to decide whether a given structure in $\mathbf{Struct}_n(\tau)$ belongs to S . Descriptive complexity aims at characterizing such subsets using logical formulas. As an example, a graph can be represented with its set of states as universe and its edges as a binary relation; that each state has at least one outgoing transition can be expressed as the first-order formula $\forall x. \exists y. E(x, y)$. The class FO of problems that can be characterized by first-order formulas is known to correspond to the class $\mathbf{AC}^0$ in circuit complexity [25].

In order to define dynamic-complexity problems, we have to define *operations* on structures. Given an operation symbol σ (from a finite alphabet Σ) with arity m , an integer n , and m elements $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_m$ of $|\mathcal{S}| = [0; n - 1]$, the operation $\sigma(a_1, \dots, a_m)$ maps structures of size n to structures of size n . We write Σ_n for the set of those operations. The semantics of those operations is defined as update functions g mapping a structure $A \in \mathbf{Struct}_n(\tau)$ and an operation in $w \in \Sigma_n$ to a structure in $\mathbf{Struct}_n(\tau)$, which we denote $w(A)$. For a finite sequence of operations $W = (w_i)_{1 \leq i \leq k}$ of operations in Σ_n , we write $W(A)$ for the structure $w_k(w_{k-1}(\dots(w_1(A)) \dots))$.

We further need to define *initializations* on structures. Given a vocabulary τ and an initialization vocabulary τ^{init} , an initialization is a function f mapping a structure $A \in \mathbf{Struct}_n(\tau^{\text{init}})$ to a structure in $\mathbf{Struct}_n(\tau)$, which we denote by $\mathcal{S}_A^n$. Hence, we may view the set $\mathbf{Struct}_n(\tau^{\text{init}})$ as an initialization alphabet Ξ_n .

Now, given a vocabulary τ , a static decision problem S over τ , an initialisation alphabet $\Xi = \bigcup_n \Xi_n$, an initialisation function f and a set operation symbols $\Sigma = \bigcup_n \Sigma_n$, the output of the *dynamic problem* associated with S and Σ is the set of non-empty words w such that $w \in \Xi_n \cdot \Sigma_n^*$ for some $n \geq 1$, and $w(\mathcal{S}_A^n) \in S$.

As a special case, which we are concerned with in this article, the initialization may consist in restricting the set of allowed operations to a set $\Sigma_A \subseteq \Sigma_n$. This case may be achieved when the vocabulary τ^{init} consists only in the relations $\sigma \in \Sigma$, i.e. when $\Xi_n = 2^{\Sigma_n}$ and when τ is the union of τ^{init} with another vocabulary τ' . Then, the structure $\mathcal{S}_A^n$ associated with a structure $A \in \Xi_n$ may simply be seen as a tuple $\langle A, \mathcal{S}_0^n \rangle$ where $\mathcal{S}_0^n$ is a reference structure over the vocabulary τ' (e.g. the empty structure).

A dynamic algorithm is a uniform family $(M_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of deterministic finite-state automata $M_n = \langle Q_n, \Xi_n, \Sigma_n, \delta_n^{\text{init}}, \delta_n^{\text{up}}, s_n, F_n \rangle$, where Q_n is the finite set of τ^{aux} -structures of size n (where τ^{aux} is the vocabulary of *auxiliary information*), Ξ_n is the set of initializations, Σ_n is the set of update operations, δ_n^{init} is the deterministic *initial* transition function, δ_n^{up} is the deterministic *update* transition function, s_n is the initial state and F_n is the set of final states. The initial transition function is used for reading the initial letter (chosen from Ξ_n) only, and the update transition function is used for reading all subsequent letters (chosen from Σ_n).

For two static complexity classes $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{C}'$, a dynamic algorithm belongs to $\mathcal{C}'\text{-Dyn}\mathcal{C}$ (written $\text{Dyn}\mathcal{C}$ when $\mathcal{C}' = \mathcal{C}$) when

- the update transition function can be computed in $\mathcal{C}$ (more precisely, the values of the predicates in the new state can be computed in $\mathcal{C}$ from the values in the previous state and from the operation being performed);
- whether a state is in F_n can be decided in $\mathcal{C}$;
- the initial state and the initial transition function can be computed in $\mathcal{C}'$.

In the sequel, we only consider the case where $\mathcal{C} = \text{FO}$, meaning that first-order formulas will be used to describe how predicates are updated along transitions.

B Additional material for Section 3

► **Lemma 3.** *Let G be a graph with n vertices and with tree-width κ . We can construct in LOGSPACE a nice tree decomposition $(\mathcal{T}, \mathbf{T})$ of G , with width at most $4\kappa + 3$ and diameter at most $c(\kappa) \cdot (\log_2(n) + 1)$, where $c(\kappa)$ only depends on κ .*

Proof. It is known [26] that we can construct in LOGSPACE a tree decomposition $\mathcal{D} = (\mathcal{T}, \mathbf{T})$ of $G = (V, E)$ with width at most $4\kappa + 3$ and with diameter at most $c'(\kappa)(\log_2(n) + 1)$, for some integer constant $c'(\kappa)$. It remains to transform $\mathcal{D}$ into a nice tree decomposition.

First, for all vertices $s \in V$, we select a node v of $\mathcal{T}$ such that $\sigma \in \mathbf{T}(v)$; we add a new node v_s and a new edge (v_s, v) to $\mathcal{T}$, and we set $\mathbf{T}(v_s)$.

Second, for every edge (v, w) of $\mathcal{T}$, let us write $\mathbf{T}(v) = \{s_1, \dots, s_k\}$ and $\mathbf{T}(w) = \{t_1, \dots, t_\ell\}$, and let us assume that we have $\mathbf{T}(v) \cap \mathbf{T}(w) = \{s_1, \dots, s_m\} = \{t_1, \dots, t_m\}$ for some m . If $k = \ell = m$, then we just merge both nodes.

Otherwise, without loss of generality we assume that $m < \ell$. We add further nodes $v_m, v_{m+1}, \dots, v_{k-1}$ and $w_{m+1}, \dots, w_{\ell-1}$ and edges $(v_m, v_{m+1}), \dots, (v_{k-2}, v_{k-1}), (v_{k-1}, v), (v_m, w_{m+1}), \dots, (w_{\ell-2}, w_{\ell-1}), (w_{\ell-1}, w)$ to $\mathcal{T}$, and we set $\mathbf{T}(v_i) = \{s_1, \dots, s_i\}$ and $\mathbf{T}(w_i) = \{t_1, \dots, t_i\}$.

Finally, we repeat the following two operation whenever available: if there exists a leaf v such that $v \notin \{v_s \mid s \in V\}$, then we delete the node v and its (only) incident edge.

Performing all these transformations can be done in LOGSPACE and leaves us with a nice tree decomposition of width at most $4\kappa + 3$ and with diameter at most $c(\kappa)(\log_2(n) + 1)$, where $c(\kappa) = 8(\kappa + 1)(c'(\kappa) + 2)$. $\blacktriangleleft$

C Additional material for Subsections 4.2 and 4.3

C.1 Decremental computation of selector views: Proof of Proposition 6

► **Proposition 6.** *Fix a V -selector f . For all integers $i \leq \ell$, it holds:*

- *if $i = \ell$, then f_i is FO-definable;*
- *if $i \leq \ell - 1$ is non-critical, then f_i is FO-definable using f_{i+1} ;*
- *if $i \leq \ell - 1$ is critical, then f_i is FO-definable using f_{i+1} and a predicate that indicates which vertices $s \in \mathbf{T}(v_i)$ are such that $f(\theta_i) = s$, and which vertices $t \in \mathbf{T}(v_i)$ are such that $f(t) = \theta_i$.*

Proof. Let f be a V -selector. We compute selector views f_i and in a *decremental* way.

First, since $|V| \geq 2$, the nice tree decomposition $(\mathcal{T}, \mathbf{T})$ must contain at least two nodes, hence $\ell \geq 2$. It follows that $\Psi_\ell = \Psi_1 \subseteq \Psi_{\leq \ell-1}$, which proves that ℓ is not critical and that $\Psi_{>\ell-1} = \emptyset$. Therefore, we have $\Psi_{>\ell-1}(v) = \emptyset$ for all $v \in \Theta_\ell$, whence $f_\ell(v, s) = ?$ for all $s \in \mathbf{T}(v)$.

We assume now that $i \leq \ell - 1$ and we wish to compute the selector view f_i using f_{i+1} . The value of $f_i(v)$ depends on the set $\Psi_{>i-1}(v) = \{s \in \Psi_{>i-1} \mid n_i(s) = v\}$. Hence, in order to compute $f_i(v)$, we must take into account two facts: (a) for some vertices $s \in V$, the nodes $n_i(s)$ and $n_{i+1}(s)$ may differ (if v_{i+1} is a child of v_i), and (b) the sets $\Psi_{>i-1}$ and $\Psi_{>i}$ may differ (if i is critical). We first deal with the former fact, and will tackle the latter one afterwards.

For all nodes $v \in \Theta_i$, we denote by $\Theta_{>i}^*(v)$, $\Psi_{>i}^*(v)$ the sets $\{w \in \Theta_{>i} \mid n_i(w) = v\}$ and $\{s \in \Psi_{>i} \mid n_i(s) = v\}$. Every edge of G with one end s in $\Psi_{>i}^*(v)$ has its other end in $\Psi_{>i}^*(v) \cup \mathbf{T}(v)$, since $\Theta_{>i}^*(v) \cup \{v\}$ is a subtree of $\mathcal{T}$ that contains $\mathcal{T}^s$.

Then, we introduce the following variant of the selector views. Consider an integer $1 \leq i \leq \ell$, a node $v \in \Theta_i$, a vertex $s \in \mathbf{T}(v)$ and a V -selector f . Let $\pi = s \cdot s_1 \cdot s_2 \dots$ be the unique (maximal) outcome of f from s . We denote by $f_i^*(v, s)$, the element of $\{?, \top, \perp\} \cup (\mathbf{T}(v) \times \{1, \dots, \mathbf{C}\})$ defined as follows:

- if π stays in $\Psi_{>i}^*(v)$ after the first step (or if $s \in \Psi_{>i}^*(v) \setminus \text{dom}(f)$) and is winning for P_0 , then $f_i^*(v, s) = \top$;
- if π stays in $\Psi_{>i}^*(v)$ after the first step (or if $s \in \Psi_{>i}^*(v) \setminus \text{dom}(f)$) and is losing for P_0 , then $f_i^*(v, s) = \perp$;
- if the first step of π does not enter $\Psi_{>i}^*(v)$ (or if $s \notin \Psi_{>i}^*(v)$ and $s \notin \text{dom}(f)$), then $f_i(v, s) = ?$;
- if π stays in $\Psi_{>i}^*(v)$ from the first step until some step $j \geq 2$, and c_m is the maximal color seen along π between s and s_{j-1} , then $f_i^*(v, s) = (s_j, c_m)$.

Note this definition is the same as Definition 5, where we use the set $\Psi_{>i}^*(v)$ instead of $\Psi_{>i-1}(v)$. We also denote by $f_i^*(v)$ the function $s \mapsto f_i^*(v, s)$.

Now, we compute f_i^* using f_{i+1} .

- If v_{i+1} is the parent of v_i , then $\Theta_{i+1} = \mathcal{A}(v_{i+1}) \subseteq \mathcal{A}(v_i) = \Theta_i$, whence $\Theta_{\leq i} = \Theta_{\leq i+1}$, and thus $n_i(s) = n_{i+1}(s)$ for all vertices $s \in \Psi_{>i}$. It follows that $\Psi_{>i}^*(v_i)$ is empty (since $v_i \notin \Theta_{i+1}$) and that $\Psi_{>i}^*(w) = \Psi_{>i}(w)$ for all $w \in \Theta_{i+1} = \Theta_i \setminus \{v_i\}$.

Hence, we have $f_i^*(v_i) : s \mapsto ?$ and $f_i^*(w) = f_i(w)$ for all nodes $w \in \Theta_i \setminus \{v_i\}$.

- If v_{i+1} is a child of v_i , then $v_{i+1} \notin \Theta_i$, hence $v_{i+1} \notin \Theta_{\leq i}$ and $\Theta_{\leq i+1} = \Theta_{\leq i} \uplus \{v_{i+1}\}$. Consequently, we have $n_i(s) = v_i$ for all vertices $s \in \Psi_{>i}(v_{i+1})$, and $n_i(s) = n_{i+1}(s)$ for all other vertices $s \in \Psi_{>i}$. It follows that $\Psi_{>i}^*(w) = \Psi_{>i}(w)$ (and thus that $f_i^*(w) = f_{i+1}(w)$) for all nodes $w \in \Theta_i \setminus \{v_i\}$, and that $\Psi_{>i}^*(v_i) = \Psi_{>i}(v_i) \uplus \Psi_{>i}(v_{i+1})$. Then, let $\Lambda(v_{i+1}, v_i)$ be the set of functions $\varphi \in \Lambda(v_{i+1})$ such that $\varphi(s) \in \{?, \top, \perp\} \cup (\mathbf{T}(v_i) \times \{1, \dots, \mathbf{C}\})$ for all $s \in \mathbf{T}(v_{i+1})$. If $i+1$ is critical, then $\theta_{i+1} \in \Psi_{>i}(v_{i+1})$, hence $\mathbf{T}(v_{i+1}) = \mathbf{T}(v_i) \uplus \{\theta_{i+1}\}$, and we have $f_{i+1}(v_{i+1}) \in \Lambda(v_{i+1}, v_i)$. If $i+1$ is non-critical, then $\mathbf{T}(v_{i+1}) \subseteq \mathbf{T}(v_i)$, and we also have $f_{i+1}(v_{i+1}) \in \Lambda(v_{i+1}, v_i)$. It follows easily that $f_i(v_i) = \pi_i^1(f_{i+1}(v_i), f_{i+1}(v_{i+1}))$, where the function $\pi_i^1: \Lambda(v_i) \times \Lambda(v_{i+1}, v_i) \rightarrow \Lambda(v_i)$ is defined by:

$$\pi_i^1(\varphi_1, \varphi_2): s \mapsto \begin{cases} \varphi_2(s) & \text{if } \varphi_2(s) \neq ? \\ \varphi_1(s) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Finally, we compute f_i when $i \leq \ell - 1$. If i is non-critical, then $\Psi_{>i-1} = \Psi_{>i}$, and therefore $f_i = f_i^*$. However, if i is critical, then computing the selector view f_i requires using f_i^* and the sets $S = \{s \in \mathbf{T}(v_i) \mid f(\theta_i) = s\}$ and $T = \{s \in \mathbf{T}(v_i) \mid f(s) = \theta_i\}$.

First, observe that θ_i is the only element of $\Psi_{>i-1} \setminus \Psi_{>i}$. Since $n_i(\theta_i) = v_i$, it follows that, for all nodes $w \in \Theta_i \setminus \{v_i\}$, we have $\Psi_{>i-1}(w) = \Psi_{>i}^*(w)$ and thus $f_i(w) = f_i^*(w)$. Hence, it remains to compute $f_i(v_i)$.

In addition, observe that S is either empty or a singleton. Then, we compute $f_i(v_i)$ in three steps:

- We first take f_i^* , S and T into account into describing the outcome of f from vertices $s \in \mathbf{T}(v_i)$. More precisely, we define a function $\pi_i^2: \Lambda(v_i) \times 2^{\mathbf{T}(v_i)} \times 2^{\mathbf{T}(v_i)} \mapsto \Lambda(v_i)$ by:

$$\pi_i^2(\varphi, S, T): x \mapsto \begin{cases} (s, c(\theta_i)) & \text{if } x = \theta_i \text{ and if } S \text{ is a singleton set } \{s\} \\ (\theta_i, c(x)) & \text{if } x \in T \\ \varphi(x) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Note that, $\theta_i \in T$ if, and only if, $S = \{\theta_i\}$, so that both definitions of $\pi_i^2(\varphi, S, T)(\theta_i)$ coincide.

- Then, we compute $f_i(v_i, \theta_i)$ using $\pi_i^2(f_i^*(v_i), S, T)$: it comes directly that $f_i(v_i, \theta_i) = \pi_i^3(\pi_i^2(f_i^*(v_i), S, T))$, where the function $\pi_i^3: \Lambda(v_i) \rightarrow \{?, \top, \perp\} \cup (\mathbf{T}(v_i) \times \{1, \dots, \mathbf{C}\})$ is defined by:

$$\pi_i^3(\varphi) = \begin{cases} \top & \text{if } \varphi(\theta_i) = ? \text{ and } \theta_i \in V_1, \text{ or if } \varphi(\theta_i) \in \{\theta_i\} \times (2\mathbb{N}) \\ \perp & \text{if } \varphi(\theta_i) = ? \text{ and } \theta_i \in V_0, \text{ or if } \varphi(\theta_i) \in \{\theta_i\} \times (2\mathbb{N} + 1) \\ \varphi(x) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

- Finally, we compute $f_i(v_i)$ using $\pi_i^2(f_i^*(v_i), S, T)$ and its image by π_i^3 : again, it comes at once that $f_i(v_i) = \pi_i^4(\pi_i^2(f_i^*(v_i), S, T))$, where the function $\pi_i^4: \Lambda(v_i) \mapsto \Lambda(v_i)$ is defined by:

$$\pi_i^4(\varphi): x \mapsto \begin{cases} \pi_i^3(\varphi) & \text{if } x = \theta_i, \text{ or if } \varphi(x) \in \{\theta_i\} \times \mathbb{N} \text{ and } \pi_i^3(\varphi) \in \{\perp, \top\} \\ (s, \max\{c_1, c_2\}) & \text{if } \varphi(x) = (\theta_i, c_1) \text{ and } \pi_i^3(\varphi) = (s, c_2) \text{ for some } s, c_1 \text{ and } c_2 \\ \varphi(x) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The computations performed above were all FO-definable. More precisely, f_i^* is always FO-definable using f_{i+1} for $i \leq \ell - 1$; furthermore, f_i is FO-definable using f_i^* if i is non-critical, or using f_i^* and the sets S and T if i is critical. This completes the proof. $\blacktriangleleft$

C.2 Decremental computation of views of V_0 -selectors: Proof of Proposition 10

► **Lemma 8.** *The vertex σ is winning for P_0 if, and only if, there exists a V_0 -selector g such that $\omega_1^g(v_1)$ is the singleton set $\{\sigma \mapsto \top\}$.*

Proof. A V_0 -selector g is winning for P_0 at σ if all its extensions lead to P_0 's victory when starting from σ , i.e. if $f_1(v_1, \sigma) = \top$ for all extensions f of g or, equivalently, if $\omega_1^g(v_1) = \{\sigma \mapsto \top\}$. Lemma 8 follows from Lemma 7. ◀

► **Lemma 9.** *Let g be a V_0 -selector, and let X be a subset of Θ_i . For every tuple $(\varphi_v)_{v \in X}$ in $\mathcal{C}^0 \cap \prod_{v \in X} \omega_i^g(v)$, there exists an extension f of g such that $\varphi_v = f_i(v)$ for all nodes $v \in X$.*

Proof. Consider a subset X of Θ_i and a tuple $(\varphi_v)_{v \in X} \in \mathcal{C}^0 \cap \prod_{v \in X} \omega_i^g(v)$. Let $(f^v)_{v \in X}$ be extensions of g such that $\varphi_v = f_i^v(v)$ for all $v \in X$. We construct an extension f of g in three successive steps, as follows:

1. for all nodes $v \in X$ and for all vertices $s \in \Psi_{>i-1}(v) \cup \{t \in \mathbf{T}(v) \mid \varphi_v(t) \neq ?\}$, we set $f(s) = f^v(s)$;
 2. for all vertices s not treated above, we set $f(s) = g(s)$,
- with the convention that, if a vertex s lies outside of the domain of a selector φ , then setting $f(s) = \varphi(s)$ amounts to excluding s from the domain of f . It is then straightforward to check that the V -selector f is well-defined and extends g and that $\varphi_v = f_i^v(v)$ for all $v \in X$. ◀

► **Proposition 10.** *Fix a V_0 -selector g . For all integers $i \leq \ell$, there exists a FO-definable function Ω_i such that:*

- if $i = \ell$, then Ω_i is a constant, and $\omega_i^g = \Omega_i$;
- if $i \leq \ell - 1$ is non-critical, then $\omega_i^g = \Omega_i(\omega_{i+1}^g)$;
- if $i \leq \ell - 1$ is critical, then $\omega_i^g = \Omega_i(\omega_{i+1}^g, (\mathbf{B}_{\theta_i, s})_{s \in \mathbf{T}(v_i)}, (\mathbf{B}'_{s, \theta_i})_{s \in \mathbf{T}(v_i)})$, where $(\mathbf{B}_{\theta_i, s})_{s \in \mathbf{T}(v_i)}$ and $(\mathbf{B}'_{s, \theta_i})_{s \in \mathbf{T}(v_i)}$ are vectors whose entries are defined by:

$$\mathbf{B}'_{x,y} = \mathbf{B}_{x,y} = \begin{cases} \{\perp\} & \text{if } (x,y) \notin E, \text{ or } x \in V_0 \setminus \text{dom}(g), \\ & \text{or } x \in \text{dom}(g) \text{ and } g(x) \neq y \\ \{\top\} & \text{if } x \in \text{dom}(g) \text{ and } g(x) = y \\ \{\perp, \top\} & \text{if } (x,y) \in E \text{ and } x \notin V_0 \end{cases}$$

Proof. Thanks to Lemma 9, the above proof of Proposition 6 leads to the following decremental recursive characterization of ω_i^g .

We started by showing that $\omega_\ell^g(v)$ is the singleton set $\{s \mapsto ?\}$, for all nodes $v \in \Theta_\ell$ and all V_0 -selectors g . Hence, ω_ℓ^g is FO-definable and does not depend on g .

Then, we follow the two-step approach used while proving Proposition 6, and we introduce sets $\omega_i^{*g}(v) = \{f_i^*(v) \mid f \text{ is an extension of } g\}$. Lemma 9 also applies to sets ω_i^{*g} : for every V_0 -selector g , every set $X \subseteq \Theta_i$ and every tuple $(\varphi_v)_{v \in X} \in \mathcal{C}^0 \cap \prod_{v \in X} \omega_i^{*g}(v)$, there exists an extension f of g such that $\varphi_v = f_i^*(v)$ for all nodes $v \in X$.

Hence, we compute the selector view ω_i^{*g} as follows for $i \leq \ell - 1$. We have $\omega_i^{*g}(x) = \omega_{i+1}^g(w)$ for all nodes $w \in \Theta_i \setminus \{v_i\}$ and, furthermore:

- if v_{i+1} is the parent of v_i , then $\omega_i^{*g}(v_i) = \{s \mapsto ?\}$;
- if v_{i+1} is a child of v_i , then $X_{v_{i+1}} \subseteq \Lambda(v_{i+1}, v_i)$, and therefore $\omega_i^{*g}(v_i) = \{\pi_i^1(\varphi_{v_i}, \varphi_{v_{i+1}}) \mid (\varphi_{v_i}, \varphi_{v_{i+1}}) \in \mathcal{C}^0 \cap (X_{v_i} \times X_{v_{i+1}})\}$.

Finally, let us compute the selector view ω_i^g . If i is non-critical, then we showed that $\omega_i^g = \omega_i^{*g}$ while proving Proposition 6. Hence, we assume that i is critical. Again, we have $\omega_i^g(w) = \omega_i^{*g}(w)$ for all nodes $w \in \Theta \setminus \{v_i\}$, and it remains to compute $\omega_i^g(v_i)$.

Consider the vectors $\mathbf{B} = (\mathbf{B}_{\theta_i, s})_{s \in \mathbf{T}(v_i)}$ and $\mathbf{B}' = (\mathbf{B}'_{s, \theta_i})_{s \in \mathbf{T}(v_i)}$ whose entries are defined by:

$$\mathbf{B}'_{x,y} = \mathbf{B}_{x,y} = \begin{cases} \{\perp\} & \text{if } (x, y) \notin E, \text{ or } x \in V_0 \setminus \text{dom}(g), \\ & \text{or } x \in \text{dom}(g) \text{ and } g(x) \neq y \\ \{\top\} & \text{if } x \in \text{dom}(g) \text{ and } g(x) = y \\ \{\perp, \top\} & \text{if } (x, y) \in E \text{ and } x \notin V_0 \end{cases}$$

We say that a triple $(f, S, T) \in \omega_i^{*g}(v_i) \times 2^{\mathbf{T}(v_i)} \times 2^{\mathbf{T}(v_i)}$ is *adapted to g at step i* if it satisfies the following criteria:

- S is of cardinality at most one, and S is empty if $f(\theta_i) \neq ?$;
- $S = \{\theta_i\}$ if and only if $\theta_i \in T$;
- $\top \in \mathbf{B}_{\theta_i, s}$ for all vertices $s \in S$, and $\perp \in \mathbf{B}_{\theta_i, s}$ for all vertices $s \in \mathbf{T}(v_i) \setminus S$;
- $\top \in \mathbf{B}'_{s, \theta_i}$ and $f(s) = ?$ for all vertices $s \in T$, and $\perp \in \mathbf{B}'_{s, \theta_i}$ for all vertices $s \in \mathbf{T}(v_i) \setminus T$.

It follows directly from Proposition 6 and from Lemma 9 that $\omega_i^g(v_i) = \{\pi_i^4(\pi_i^2(\varphi, S, T)) \mid (\varphi, S, T) \text{ is adapted to } g \text{ at step } i\}$.

The computations performed above were all FO-definable, which completes the proof. ◀

D Complements to Section 5: Complexity analysis

The results presented in Section 4 (and complements in the previous appendices) provide us with a dynamic algorithm for solving Problem DynParity $_{\mathbf{C}, \kappa}$, which consists in a precomputation phase and update phases.

During the precomputation phase, we first need to compute:

- a nice tree decomposition $\mathcal{D} = (\mathcal{T}, \mathbf{T})$ rooted at σ and a depth-first traversal of $\mathcal{T}$;
- the vertices and edges of the graph Γ_{G_ϵ} on which we will perform Dyck reachability tests, when G_ϵ is the graph $(V, \emptyset, c, V_0, V_1)$ with empty set of edges;
- the predicates T and π_2 on the graph Γ_{G_ϵ} ,

where the 2-ary predicate T and the 4-ary predicate π_2 are defined in [31] as follows.

The predicate $T(\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2)$ holds if, and only if, there exists a path from $\mathbf{v}_1$ to $\mathbf{v}_2$ in Γ_{G_ϵ} . The predicate $\pi_2(\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2, \mathbf{v}'_1, \mathbf{v}'_2)$ holds if, and only if, there exist a path π from $\mathbf{v}_1$ to $\mathbf{v}_2$, with label λ , and a path π' from $\mathbf{v}'_1$ to $\mathbf{v}'_2$, with label λ' , such that $\lambda \cdot \lambda'$ is a Dyck word.

We claim that such precomputations can be performed in LOGSPACE.

First, Lemma 3 proves that the tree decomposition $\mathcal{D}$ can be computed in LOGSPACE, and has diameter at most $c(\kappa)(\log_2(n) + 1)$.

A second issue is to compute the graph Γ_{G_ϵ} . We first bound the size of the tree decomposition $\mathcal{D}$, the length ℓ of the depth-first traversal $v_1, \dots, v_\ell$ and the size of the sets $\Lambda_i = \prod_{v \in \Theta_i} 2^{\Lambda(v)}$ for all $i \leq \ell$.

The tree $\mathcal{T}$ has at most n leaves (since $\mathcal{D}$ is a nice tree decomposition) and has diameter at most $c(\kappa)(\log_2(n) + 1)$, hence it contains at most $nc(\kappa)(\log_2(n) + 1)$ nodes. Then, each pair (v_i, v_{i+1}) of consecutive vertices of the depth-first traversal $v_1, \dots, v_\ell$ is an oriented edge of $\mathcal{T}$, and no edge may appear twice, hence $\ell \leq 2nc(\kappa)(\log_2(n) + 1) - 1 \leq 2n^2c(\kappa)$.

Finally, for all nodes v of $\mathcal{T}$, recall that $|\Lambda(v)| \leq \mathbf{K}$, where $\mathbf{K} = (3 + 4(\kappa + 1)\mathbf{C})^{4(\kappa+1)}$, and that Θ_i is of size at most $c(\kappa)(\log_2(n) + 1)$. It follows that Λ_i is of size at most $\mathbf{K}^{c(\kappa)(\log_2(n)+1)} \leq K^{c(\kappa)} n^{c(\kappa) \log_2(\mathbf{K})}$.

Consequently, we compute Γ_{G_ϵ} as follows. First, we choose some (arbitrary) linear order $\leq$ on V and we perform a depth-first traversal of $\mathcal{T}$. Then, we identify the set $[1; \ell]$ with a subset of $V^2 \times [1; 2c(\kappa)]$, and we identify each set Λ_i with a subset of $V^{\lceil c(\kappa) \log_2(\mathbf{K}) \rceil} \times [1; K^{c(\kappa)}]$. Such identifications can be performed in LOGSPACE, for instance by deriving a linear order on each set Λ_i from the order $\leq$.

Moreover, since each function Ω_i or Ω_i^* is FO-definable, we can decide in LOGSPACE whether, for each tuple $(\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2, \lambda)$ formed of two vertices and one label of Γ_{G_ϵ} , there exists an edge $(\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2)$ with label λ in Γ_{G_ϵ} .

Then, we precompute the predicate T , which indicates whether a vertex $\mathbf{v}_1$ is accessible from another vertex $\mathbf{v}_2$ (regardless of labels). Let us begin with preliminary remarks, that follow directly from the construction of the graph Γ_G .

First, all paths of length 3 contain at least one nominal vertex (i, Z) . Henceforth, we say that a path is *short* if its length is at most 3.

Second, every nominal vertex $\mathbf{v}$ has at most one successor $\mathbf{w}$, where a vertex $\mathbf{w}$ is said to be a *successor* of a vertex $\mathbf{v}$ if there exists a labelled edge $\mathbf{v} \rightarrow \mathbf{w}$. More precisely:

- if $\mathbf{v}$ is of the form $(i+1, Z)$ for some critical index i , then $\mathbf{w}$ exists and is equal to $(i, 0)$;
- if $\mathbf{v}$ is of the form $(i+1, Z)$ for some non-critical index i , then $\mathbf{w}$ is of the form (i, Z') if it exists.

Consequently, for all nominal vertices $\mathbf{v}_1$ and $\mathbf{v}_2$, checking whether there exists a path from $\mathbf{v}_1$ to $\mathbf{v}_2$ that does not use any vertex $(i, 0)$ as an intermediary step is an easy task: it suffices to start from the vertex $v = \mathbf{v}_1$, and then to recursively replace v by its unique successor, until we either reach $\mathbf{v}_2$, or a vertex $(i, 0)$, or a vertex v with no outgoing edge. Moreover, the same technique also allows us to compute the greatest integer I such that a vertex $(I, 0)$ is reachable from $\mathbf{v}_1$, if any such integer exists.

Hence, consider two vertices $\mathbf{v}_1$ and $\mathbf{v}_2$ of Γ_{G_ϵ} . We first assume that $\mathbf{v}_1$ and $\mathbf{v}_2$ are nominal vertices, of the form (i_1, Z_1) and (i_2, Z_2) . If there exists no critical index I with $i_1 < I \leq i_2$, then all paths from $\mathbf{v}_1$ to $\mathbf{v}_2$ avoid vertices of the form $(i, 0)$, thus one can check whether such paths exist.

Therefore, we also assume that there exists a critical index I with $i_1 < I \leq i_2$. Let $I_{\min}$ be the smallest such index, and let $I_{\max}$ be the greatest such index. By construction, there exists a path from $(I_{\max}, 0)$ to $(I_{\min}, 0)$, and every path from $\mathbf{v}_1$ to $\mathbf{v}_2$ must to through both $(I_{\max}, 0)$ and $(I_{\min}, 0)$. Furthermore, if some vertex $(I, 0)$ is reachable from $\mathbf{v}_1$, then $I_{\max}$ is the greatest such integer. Hence, one can check whether there exists a path from $\mathbf{v}_1$ to $(I_{\max}, 0)$, and it remains to compute $I_{\min}$ and to check whether there exists a path from $(I_{\min}, 0)$ to $\mathbf{v}_2$.

By construction, there exist $|\Lambda(v_{I_{\min}})| \cdot 2^{|\Psi_{I_{\min}-1}|}$ nominal vertices $\mathbf{v}_3$ of the form $(I_{\min}, Z')$. For all such vertices $\mathbf{v}_3$, it is again easy to check whether $\mathbf{v}_3$ is reachable from $(I_{\min}, 0)$ (since all paths from $(I_{\min}, 0)$ to $\mathbf{v}_3$ are short) and whether $\mathbf{v}_2$ is reachable from $\mathbf{v}_3$ (since no path from $\mathbf{v}_3$ to $\mathbf{v}_2$ can use a vertex $(i, 0)$).

It remains to treat the case where $\mathbf{v}_1$ and $\mathbf{v}_2$ are of no particular form. There, either there exists a short path from $\mathbf{v}_1$ to $\mathbf{v}_2$, or there exists nominal vertices $\mathbf{v}'_1$ and $\mathbf{v}'_2$ such that:

- there exists a short path from $\mathbf{v}_1$ to $\mathbf{v}'_1$;
- there exists a short path from $\mathbf{v}'_2$ to $\mathbf{v}_2$;
- there exists a path from $\mathbf{v}'_1$ to $\mathbf{v}'_2$.

Enumerating all possible vertices $\mathbf{v}'_1$ and $\mathbf{v}'_2$ and checking whether such paths exist, using the method described above, is feasible in LOGSPACE.

We are left with computing the predicate π_2 . This latter computation is based on the layered structure of the graph Γ_G and of its labels. Recall (from Section 4.4) that the Dyck

paths are either sub-paths of nominal Dyck paths, or generic Dyck paths, i.e. concatenations of nominal Dyck paths.

Hence, consider paths π_1 and π_2 in Γ_G , with respective labels λ_1 , λ_2 , and let π be a sub-path of π_1 . If π is a sub-path of a nominal (non-Dyck) path but is not a sub-path of any nominal Dyck path, then, by construction of the graph Γ_G , the word $\lambda_1 \cdot \lambda_2$ cannot be a Dyck word.

From this remark, it follows that the word $\lambda_1 \cdot \lambda_2$ is a Dyck word if, and only if, we are in one of the cases below:

- both π_1 and π_2 are Dyck paths;
- there exists a sub-path ρ of a nominal Dyck path such that both ρ and $\pi_1 \cdot \rho \cdot \pi_2$ are Dyck paths (in particular, note that the source of ρ must coincide with the sink of π_1 , and that the sink of ρ must coincide with the source of π_2);
- there exists paths ρ_1, ρ_2, ρ_3 and ρ_4 such that $\pi_1 = \rho_1 \cdot \rho_2$, $\pi_2 = \rho_3 \cdot \rho_4$ and that all of ρ_2, ρ_3 and $\rho_1 \cdot \rho_4$ are Dyck paths.

Hence, the problem of computing π_2 is LOGSPACE-reducible to the problem of computing, for all vertices $\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_4$, a Dyck path with source $\mathbf{v}_1$, sink $\mathbf{v}_2$, and that goes through $\mathbf{v}_3$ and $\mathbf{v}_4$ (if such a path exists).

Moreover, when $G = G_\epsilon$, for all nominal vertices $\mathbf{v}$, there exists at most one nominal Dyck path with source $\mathbf{v}$; that path is the unique minimal Dyck path with source $\mathbf{v}$ (if it exists). This makes the problem of computing π_2 in LOGSPACE feasible, which completes the proof that the whole precomputation can be done in LOGSPACE.

During the update phases, and whenever introducing or deleting an edge e in G , we must delete or introduce a bounded number of edges in Γ_G ; these edges are identified by FO formulas taking the edge e into account. Consequently, updating the edge membership predicate of Γ_G and the predicates T and π_2 can be done with FO formulas. Finally, deducing whether σ is winning from these predicates can be done using FO formulas again, which completes the proof of Theorem 1.

E Dyck reachability with witness

Our dynamic algorithm for solving $\text{DynParity}_{C,\kappa}$ goes through an ad-hoc Dyck query over a graph. We present this problem, and then analyze its dynamic complexity, which is DynFO.

Context-free graph query in acyclic graphs belong to the dynamic complexity class DynFO [29, 31]. We prove here a variant of this result.

Let $G = (V, E, L)$ with $E \subseteq V \times L \times V$ be a labelled acyclic graph, whose labels are drawn from a set $L = L^+ \cup L^\circ \cup L^-$, where L^+ and L^- are in bijection with each other. Let $x \mapsto \bar{x}$ be an involution of L that maps L^+ to L^- (and vice-versa) and fixes each element of L° (those are “neutral” elements).

The Dyck reachability problem with witness asks for triples (s, t, ρ) , where s, t are vertices of G and ρ is a path from s to t that is labelled by a string in the language $\mathbf{D}$ of *Dyck words* built over the grammar: $S \rightarrow \varepsilon \mid \ell \cdot S \cdot \bar{\ell} \cdot S \mid S \cdot \bullet \cdot S$, where $\ell \in L^+ \cup L^-$ and $\bullet \in L^\circ$.

Such a path may be viewed as a finite sequence $\mathbf{S} = s_0 \cdot \ell_0 \cdot s_1 \cdot \ell_1 \cdot \dots \cdot \ell_{k-1} \cdot s_k$, where $(s_i, \ell_i, s_{i+1}) \in E$ for all $i < k$, and we define its *representative* as the predicate

$$R^{\mathbf{S}}(u, \ell, v) \equiv u = v \vee \exists i \in \{0, \dots, k-1\}, (u, \ell, v) = (s_i, \ell_i, s_{i+1}).$$

The Dyck reachability problem with witness in acyclic graph is as follows: Given a labelled acyclic graph $G = (V, E, L)$ and two vertices s and t , is there a Dyck path with source s and

sink t ? If yes, give a predicate that represents such a path; if no, give an empty predicate. The dynamic version of that problem, denoted **Dyck+*witness***, assumes insertion and deletion of labelled edges (with the restriction that the graph should remain acyclic—which can be checked). We assume we start from an empty set of edges.

► **Theorem 12.** *Problem Dyck+*witness* can be solved in DynFO.*

Before developing a complete proof, we begin with an intuitive sketch.

E.1 Sketch of the proof

Our proof is inspired by that of [31, Theorem 7.2], which proves that checking whether Dyck paths exist, in the case $L^+ = \{a, b\}$, $L^- = \emptyset$ and $L^\circ = \{\bar{a}, \bar{b}\}$, is in DynFO.

Their proof is two-fold. First, they introduce predicates $\pi_k(u_1, v_1, \dots, u_k, v_k)$ that hold iff there exists paths from u_i to v_i with strings s_i such that $s_1 \cdots s_k$ is a Dyck word, and compute each predicate π_k as a first-order formula over the vocabulary formed of π_2 , of the transitive closure of the graph, and of predicates for checking membership in E .

Second, they devise first-order formulas, over the same vocabulary augmented with predicates π_k , that allow updating the value of π_2 , from which they deduce a solution to the Dyck reachability problem. Such formulas rely on the two following principles.

- if G' is the graph obtained from G by adding an edge (s, λ, t) , then each (not necessarily Dyck) path $a \rightarrow b$ in G' can be identified either with a path $a \rightarrow b$ in G or with a pair $(a \rightarrow s, t \rightarrow b)$ of paths in G ;
- if G' is the graph obtained from G by deleting an edge (s, λ, t) , then each path $a \rightarrow b$ in G' can be identified either with a path $a \rightarrow b$ in G (if s is not accessible from a or b is not accessible from s) or with a triple $(a \rightarrow x, (x, \mu, y), y \rightarrow b)$ where $a \rightarrow x$, $y \rightarrow b$ are paths in G and (x, μ, y) is an edge of G' such that s is accessible from x but not from y .

Our adaptation is as follows. First, we introduce auxiliary vertices $\bullet$ and ℓ (for all labels $\ell \in L$) and labelled edges $(\ell, \ell, \bullet)$ to G . This shall allow us to select paths with label ℓ by selecting the unique path that goes from ℓ to $\bullet$, in order to easily select and simulate the behavior of the above-mentioned edges (s, λ, t) and (x, μ, y) , while avoiding the dissymmetry between labels ℓ and $\bar{\ell}$ that complicates the proofs of [31, Lemmas 7.4 and 7.5].


Second, while following the construction of the predicates π_k of [31], we also maintain in FO predicates q_k of arity $5k$ that, for each tuple $(u_1, v_1, \dots, u_k, v_k)$ satisfying π_k , represent simultaneously paths ρ_i from u_i to v_i with labels s_i such that $s_1 \cdots s_k$ is a Dyck word. The proof of [31, Lemma 7.3] provides a recursive procedure for checking whether collections $(\rho_1, \dots, \rho_k)$ exist; we select unambiguously one such collection by maintaining a linear order on those vertices that may be traversed by some path ρ_i , following this recursive procedure and, whenever this procedure uses a universal quantification on vertices satisfying a property φ , we chose the minimal vertex satisfying φ .

Having constructed *witnesses* for the predicates π_k , we adapt the principles used in [31] for updating the predicate π_2 , thereby updating the predicate q_2 as well, from which we deduce a solution to the Dyck reachability problem with witness.

E.2 Complete proof of Theorem 12.

We first assume that the sets V and L are disjoint (up to replacing V and L by sets $\{(x, V) \mid x \in V\}$ and $\{(x, L) \mid x \in L\}$), and consider some *fresh* symbol $\bullet$, which does not belong to V nor to L .

We replace now the graph $G = (V, E, L)$ by the new labelled acyclic graph $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}, L)$ defined by: $\mathcal{V} = V \cup L \cup \{\bullet\}$ and $\mathcal{E} = E \cup \{(\ell, \bullet) \mid \ell \in L\}$. Observe that $\mathcal{G}$ can be computed from G and from a first-order formula, and that inserting/deleting one labelled edge in G amounts to inserting/deleting one labelled edge in $\mathcal{G}$. Hence, we work on the graph $\mathcal{G}$.




■ **Figure 4** From G to $\mathcal{G}$ via adding vertices and edges

We recall now some facts that are proved in [31]. First, observe that the edge relation E can obviously be maintained in **FO**, since we track insertions and deletions of edges.

Second, the transitive closure of $\mathcal{G}$, ignoring the labels, can be also maintained in **FO**. More precisely, in what follows, we denote by $\mathcal{G}'$ the graph obtained from $\mathcal{G}$ by inserting/deleting an edge and, for each predicate X over $\mathcal{G}$, we denote by X' the analogous predicate over $\mathcal{G}'$. Here, denoting by T the transitive closure in $\mathcal{G}$, there exists update formulas:

- $T'(u, v) \equiv T(u, v) \vee (T(u, s) \wedge T(t, v))$ after the insertion of some edge (s, ℓ, t) ;
- $T'(u, v) \equiv T(u, v) \wedge (T_1(u, v, s) \vee \exists(x, \mu, y) \in \mathcal{E}, T_2(u, v, x, \mu, y, s, \ell, t))$ after the deletion of some edge (s, ℓ, t) ,

where $T_1(u, v, s) \equiv T(v, s) \vee \neg T(u, s)$ and $T_2(u, v, x, \mu, y, s, \ell, t) \equiv (x, \mu, y) \neq (s, \ell, t) \wedge T(u, x) \wedge T(y, v) \wedge T(x, s) \wedge \neg T(y, s)$. Indeed if $T_1(u, v, s)$ holds, then no path in $\mathcal{G}(u, v)$ can use the edge (s, ℓ, t) ; if it does not hold, then $T'(u, v)$ holds if and only if there exists a path in $\mathcal{G}(u, v)$ that does not use the edge (s, ℓ, t) for exiting the set of vertices $\{z \in V \mid T(z, s)\}$, to which u belongs but v does not belong.



■ **Figure 5** Exiting the set $\{z \in V \mid T(z, s)\}$ (in gray) without using the edge (s, ℓ, t)

Third, consider the predicates π_k defined as follows for all $k \geq 1$:

$$\pi_k(u_1, v_1, \dots, u_k, v_k) \equiv \exists(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_k) \in \mathcal{G}(u_1, v_1) \times \dots \times \mathcal{G}(u_k, v_k), [\sigma_1] \cdot \dots \cdot [\sigma_k] \in \mathbf{D}.$$

It is proved in [31, Lemma 7.3] that all predicates π_k belong to FO $[\pi_2]$ and, more precisely, that the following formulas hold for $k \geq 3$:

$$\pi_k(u_1, v_1, \dots, u_k, v_k) \equiv \bigvee_{i=2}^{k-1} \exists x, y, z \in \mathcal{V}, \Pi_k^i(u_1, v_1, \dots, u_k, v_k, x, y, z),$$

where Π_k^i is defined as:

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_k(u_1, v_1, \dots, u_k, v_k, x, y, z) \equiv & \pi_2(x, v_1, u_2, z) \wedge \pi_{k+2-i}(u_1, x, y, v_i, \dots, u_k, v_k) \\ & \wedge \pi_{i-1}(z, v_2, \dots, u_i, y) \end{aligned}$$

Third, we prove that π_2 can be maintained in FO. First, when G has no edge, π_2 can be computed from a FO formula. Then, our proof is similar to that of [31], with the following difference: we will quantify over variables in L , whereas such a quantification was implicit in [31], where L was the fixed set $\{a, \bar{a}, b, \bar{b}\}$. Our augmented structure $\mathcal{G}$ will mostly be useful here, since $\ell \cdot \ell \cdot \bullet$ is the unique path in $\mathcal{G}(\ell, \bullet)$ for all $\ell \in L$.

We first compute the updated version π'_2 of the predicate π_2 after inserting an edge (s, ℓ, t) . Consider a pair $(\mathbf{S}_1, \mathbf{S}_2)$ of paths in the updated graph $\mathcal{G}'$, such that $[\mathbf{S}_1] \cdot [\mathbf{S}_2] \in \mathbf{D}$. Four cases are possible, depending on whether $\mathbf{S}_1$ and/or $\mathbf{S}_2$ use the edge (s, ℓ, t) . For each pair $(u, v) \in \mathcal{V}^2$, every path $\mathbf{S} \in \mathcal{G}'(u, v)$ that uses the edge (s, ℓ, t) can be split into three smaller paths $\mathbf{S}^1 \in \mathcal{G}(u, s)$, $\mathbf{S}^2 = s \cdot \ell \cdot t$ and $\mathbf{S}^3 \in \mathcal{G}(t, v)$, such that $[\mathbf{S}] = [\mathbf{S}^1] \cdot [\mathbf{S}^2] \cdot [\mathbf{S}^3]$. Finally, since $\mathbf{S}^2$ is not yet a path in $\mathcal{G}$, we replace it with the path $\ell \cdot \ell \cdot \bullet$, whose label is also $\ell = [\mathbf{S}^2]$. Hence, it follows that:

$$\begin{aligned} \pi'_2(u_1, v_1, u_2, v_2) \equiv & \pi_2(u_1, v_1, u_2, v_2) \vee \pi_4(u_1, s, \lambda, \bullet, t, v_1, u_2, v_2) \vee \pi_4(u_1, v_1, u_2, s, \lambda, \bullet, t, v_2) \\ & \vee \pi_4(u_1, s, \lambda, \bullet, t, v_1, u_2, s, \lambda, \bullet, t, v_2) \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, after deleting an edge (s, ℓ, t) , consider a pair $(\mathbf{S}_1, \mathbf{S}_2)$ of paths in the updated graph $\mathcal{G}$, such that $[\mathbf{S}_1] \cdot [\mathbf{S}_2] \in \mathbf{D}$. For each pair $(u, v) \in \mathcal{V}^2$, a path $\mathbf{S} \in \mathcal{G}(u, v)$ still exists in $\mathcal{G}'$ if and only if either $T_1(u, v, s)$ holds, or if $\mathbf{S}$ does not use the edge (s, ℓ, t) to exit the set $\mathcal{Z} = \{z \in \mathcal{V} \mid T(z, s)\}$. In the latter case, there exists some edge (x, μ, y) that exists $\mathcal{Z}$ and such that $\mathbf{S}$ can be split into three smaller paths $\mathbf{S}^1 \in \mathcal{G}(u, x)$, $\mathbf{S}^2 = x \cdot \mu \cdot y$ and $\mathbf{S}^3 \in \mathcal{G}(y, v)$. Here, observe that $\mathbf{S}^2$ may not be the only path in $\mathcal{G}(x, y)$, which might even contain paths using the edge (s, ℓ, t) . Hence, we ensure the choice of a path $\tilde{\mathbf{S}}^2$ with label $\mu = [\mathbf{S}^2]$ by choosing $\tilde{\mathbf{S}}^2$ inside the set $\mathcal{G}(\mu, \bullet)$. It follows that $\pi'_2(u_1, v_1, u_2, v_2) \equiv \psi_1 \vee \psi_2 \vee \psi_3 \vee \psi_4$, where:

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_1 &\equiv \pi_2(u_1, v_1, u_2, v_2) \wedge T_1(u_1, v_1, s) \wedge T_1(u_2, v_2, s) \\ \psi_2 &\equiv \exists(a, \mu, b) \in \mathcal{E}, T_2(u_1, v_1, a, \mu, b, s, \lambda, t) \wedge T_1(u_2, v_2, s) \wedge \pi_4(u_1, a, \mu, \bullet, b, v_1, u_2, v_2) \\ \psi_3 &\equiv \exists(c, \nu, d) \in \mathcal{E}, T_1(u_1, v_1, x) \wedge T_2(u_2, v_2, c, \nu, d, x, \lambda, y) \wedge \pi_4(u_1, v_1, v_1, c, \nu, \bullet, d, v_2) \\ \psi_4 &\equiv \exists(a, \mu, b), (c, \nu, d) \in \mathcal{E}, T_2(u_1, v_1, a, \mu, b, x, \lambda, y) \wedge T_2(u_2, v_2, c, \nu, d, x, \lambda, y) \wedge \\ &\quad \pi_6(u_1, a, \mu, \bullet, b, v_1, u_2, c, \nu, \bullet, d, v_2) \end{aligned}$$

So far, we mostly rephrased the proof of [31]. We show now how witnesses can be extracted and maintained in FO.

To that end, we first need to maintain a linear order $\leq$ (which we may view as a binary predicate) on the a set S that contains all *activated* vertices and labels of the *original* graph G . More precisely, we say that the elements of the set

$$\begin{aligned} \{\bullet\} \cup \{v \in V \mid \exists w \in V, \exists \ell \in L, (v, \ell, w) \in E \vee (w, \ell, v) \in E\} \\ \cup \{\ell, \bar{\ell} \in L \mid \exists v, w \in V, (v, \ell, w) \in E\} \end{aligned}$$

are activated, and S must contain all these elements. However, as soon as this constraint is satisfied, the set S and the order $\leq$ on S are themselves arbitrary.

First, when G contains no edge, we choose $S = \{\bullet\}$, and $\leq$ is the unique order on S . In addition, for every vertex $z \in \mathcal{V}$ and every binary predicate P over $\mathcal{V}$, we denote by $\mathbf{Ext}[z, P]$ the binary predicate defined by: $\mathbf{Ext}[z, P](u, v) \equiv P(u, v) \vee (v = z \wedge \neg P(z, z))$. In the case where P is a linear order on some subset Σ of $\mathcal{V}$, then $\mathbf{Ext}[z, P]$ either is equal to P , if $z \in \Sigma$, or is obtained by extending $\leq$ to $\Sigma \cup \{z\}$, with z as new greatest element.

Hence, after inserting an edge (s, ℓ, t) , we choose $S' = S \cup \{s, t, \ell, \bar{\ell}\}$ and we choose $\leq'$ to be the linear order on S' defined as $\leq' \equiv \mathbf{Ext}[s, \mathbf{Ext}[t, \mathbf{Ext}[\ell, \mathbf{Ext}[\bar{\ell}, \leq]]]]$. Conversely, after deleting an edge (s, ℓ, t) , we do not change S nor $\leq$.

Then, we follow the above proof that π_2 can be maintained in FO, but we do so in a constructive manner, maintaining witnesses for each of the predicates π_k . More precisely, for all $k \geq 1$, we consider a predicate $\rho_k(u_1, v_1, w_1, \lambda_1, x_1, \dots, u_k, v_k, w_k, \lambda_k, x_k)$ that satisfies the following property $\mathcal{Q}_k$: “for all tuples $(u_1, v_1, \dots, u_k, v_k)$ that satisfy π_k , there exists paths $\mathbf{S}_1 \in \mathcal{G}(u_1, v_1), \dots, \mathbf{S}_k \in \mathcal{G}(u_k, v_k)$ such that $[\mathbf{S}_1] \cdot \dots \cdot [\mathbf{S}_k]$ is a Dyck word and such that $\rho_k(u_1, v_1, w_1, \lambda_1, x_1, \dots, u_k, v_k, w_k, \lambda_k, x_k) \equiv \bigwedge_{i=1}^k R^{\mathbf{S}_i}(w_i, \lambda_i, x_i)$, where we recall that $R^{\mathbf{S}}$ is the predicate that represents the path $\mathbf{S}$.”

Note that, from such a predicate, recovering each of the predicates $R^{\mathbf{S}_i}$ is straightforward, using universal quantification over the variables w_j, λ_j, x_j for $j \neq i$. In addition, it $\mathbf{S}_1$ is a path whose sink is the source of some other path $\mathbf{S}_2$, then the concatenated path $\mathbf{S}_1 \cdot \mathbf{S}_2$ is represented by the predicate $R^{\mathbf{S}_1} \vee R^{\mathbf{S}_2}$. Hence, it is harmless to say that the predicates ρ_k provide us with *tuples of paths* instead of predicates representing such tuples, and it will also be harmless to perform projections on such tuples or concatenation operations on pairs of words that share a sink and source.

Like the order $\leq$, such predicates ρ_k are not uniquely defined. Hence, we will use the order $\leq$ to build predicates ρ_k unambiguously. We prove now that such predicates ρ_k belong to FO $[\leq, \pi_2, \rho_2]$.

We first choose $\rho_1(u_1, v_1, w_1, \lambda_1, x_1) \equiv \rho_2(u_1, v_1, w_1, \lambda_1, x_1, u_1, u_1, \lambda_1, u_1)$. We then treat the case $k \geq 3$ by induction, noting that our task reduces to finding, using FO formulas, a canonical tuple (x, y, z, i) such that $\Pi_k^i(u_1, v_1, \dots, u_k, v_k, x, y, z)$ holds. First, if (x, y, z, i) is such a tuple, we know that each of x, y and z either are activated or belong to $\{u_1, v_1, \dots, u_k, v_k\}$. Indeed, if x is not activated, then we must have $x = u_1 = v_1$, and similarly for y and z . Hence, we transform the order $\leq$ into the order $\preceq \equiv \mathbf{Ext}[u_1, \mathbf{Ext}[v_1, \dots, \mathbf{Ext}[u_k, \mathbf{Ext}[v_k, \leq]]]]$, and we know that x, y, z must belong to the domain of $\preceq$.

Consequently, there exists a minimal tuple (x, y, z, i) (for the lexicographical order on $\text{dom}(\preceq)^3 \times \{2, \dots, k-1\}$) such that $\Pi_k^i(u_1, v_1, \dots, u_k, v_k, x, y, z)$ holds, and this tuple is definable in FO $[\preceq, \pi_2, \dots, \pi_{k-1}]$, hence in FO $[\leq, \pi_2]$. Then, by induction hypothesis, we know that ρ_2, ρ_{k+2-i} and ρ_{i-1} provide us with the path families $(\tau_1, \tau_2) \in \mathcal{G}(x, v_1) \times \mathcal{G}(u_2, z)$, $(\tau_0, \tau_5, \mathbf{S}_{i+1}, \dots, \mathbf{S}_k) \in \mathcal{G}(u_1, x) \times \mathcal{G}(y, v_i) \times \mathcal{G}(u_{i+1}, v_{i+1}) \times \dots \times \mathcal{G}(u_k, v_k)$ and $(\tau_3, \mathbf{S}_2, \dots, \mathbf{S}_{i-1}, \tau_4) \in \mathcal{G}(z, v_2) \times \mathcal{G}(u_3, v_3) \times \dots \times \mathcal{G}(u_i, y)$.

Hence, we set $\mathbf{S}_1 = \tau_0 \cdot \tau_1$, $\mathbf{S}_2 = \tau_2 \cdot \tau_3$ and $\mathbf{S}_i = \tau_4 \cdot \tau_5$. It follows that all of the predicates $R^{\mathbf{S}_1}, \dots, R^{\mathbf{S}_k}$ belong to FO $[\leq, \pi_2, \rho_1, \dots, \rho_{k-1}]$, hence to FO $[\leq, \pi_2, \rho_2]$, and so does ρ_k .

Finally, we show that some predicate ρ_2 satisfying the property $\mathcal{Q}_2$ can be maintained in FO. First, when G does not contain any edge, observe that each set $\mathcal{G}(u, v)$ is either the singleton $\{u, u, v\}$, if $u \in L$ and $v = \bullet$, or the empty set. Hence, there is a unique way of choosing ρ_2 , which can be done with first-order formulas.

Then, consider four vertices $u_1, v_1, u_2, v_2 \in \mathcal{V}$. After inserting an edge (s, ℓ, t) , deciding whether $\pi_2'(u_1, v_1, u_2, v_2)$ holds can be done by considering four mutually exclusive cases:

1. some paths $\mathbf{S}_1$ and $\mathbf{S}_2$, going from u_1 to v_1 and from u_1 to v_2 , and such that $[\mathbf{S}_1] \cdot [\mathbf{S}_2] \in \mathbf{D}$, already exist in $\mathcal{G}$; in that case, ρ_2 provides us with two such paths $\mathbf{S}_1 \in \mathcal{G}(u_1, v_1)$ and $\mathbf{S}_2 \in \mathcal{G}(u_2, v_2)$;
2. case #1 is false, but such paths exist if we allow $\mathbf{S}_1$ to use the edge (s, ℓ, t) ; in that case, ρ_4 provides us with four paths $\tau_0 \in \mathcal{G}(u_1, s)$, $\tau_1 = \ell \cdot \ell \cdot \bullet$, $\tau_2 \in \mathcal{G}(t, v_1)$ and $\mathbf{S}_2 \in \mathcal{G}(u_2, v_2)$, and we set $\mathbf{S}_1 = \tau_0 \cdot (s \cdot \ell \cdot t) \cdot \tau_2$;
3. cases #1 and #2 are false, but such paths exist if we allow $\mathbf{S}_2$ to use the edge (s, ℓ, t) ; in that case, ρ_4 provides us with four paths $\mathbf{S}_1 \in \mathcal{G}(u_1, v_1)$, $\tau_3 \in \mathcal{G}(u_2, s)$, $\tau_4 = \ell \cdot \ell \cdot \bullet$ and $\tau_5 \in \mathcal{G}(t, v_2)$, and we set $\mathbf{S}_2 = \tau_3 \cdot (s \cdot \ell \cdot t) \cdot \tau_5$;
4. cases #1 to #3 are false, but such paths exist if we allow both $\mathbf{S}_1$ and $\mathbf{S}_2$ to use the edge s, ℓ, t ; in that case, ρ_6 provides us with six paths $\tau_0, \dots, \tau_5$, and we set $\mathbf{S}_1$ and $\mathbf{S}_2$ as above.

Formulas in FO $[\pi_2]$ indicate in which of these cases we are, then formulas in FO $[\pi_2, \rho_2, \rho_4, \rho_6]$ provide us with two paths $\mathbf{S}_1$ and $\mathbf{S}_2$ that are defined unambiguously, which proves that ρ'_2 may indeed be defined in FO $[\leq, \pi_2, \rho_2]$.

Similarly, after deleting an edge (s, ℓ, t) , consider four vertices $u_1, v_1, u_2, v_2 \in \mathcal{V}$. Deciding whether $\pi'_2(u_1, v_1, u_2, v_2)$ holds can be done by considering four mutually exclusive cases, depending on whether $T_1(u_1, v_1, s)$ and/or $T_2(u_2, v_2, s)$ holds. For instance, if $T_1(u_1, v_1, s)$ does not hold, there exists an edge (a, μ, b) such that $T_2(u_1, v_1, a, \mu, b, s, \ell, t)$ holds, and we can choose (a, μ, b) to be minimal for the lexicographical order induced by $\leq$: this edge can be selected unambiguously by using a formula in FO $[T, \leq]$. Similarly, if $T_1(u_2, v_2, s)$ does not hold, we can choose unambiguously a minimal edge (c, ν, d) such that $T_2(u_2, v_2, c, \nu, d, s, \ell, t)$ holds. This leads us to considering four mutually exclusive cases:

1. if both $T_1(u_1, v_1, s)$ and $T_1(u_2, v_2, s)$ hold, then ρ_2 provides us with two paths $\mathbf{S}_1 \in \mathcal{G}(u_1, v_1)$ and $\mathbf{S}_2 \in \mathcal{G}(u_2, v_2)$ such that $[\mathbf{S}_1] \cdot [\mathbf{S}_2] \in \mathbf{D}$;
2. if only $T_1(u_1, v_1, s)$ fails to hold, then ρ_4 provides us with four paths $\tau_0 \in \mathcal{G}(u_1, a)$, $\tau_1 = \mu \cdot \mu \cdot \bullet$, $\tau_2 \in \mathcal{G}(b, v_1)$ and $\mathbf{S}_2 \in \mathcal{G}(u_2, v_2)$, and we set $\mathbf{S}_1 = \tau_0 \cdot (a \cdot \mu \cdot b) \cdot \tau_2$;
3. if only $T_1(u_2, v_2, s)$ fails to hold, then ρ_4 provides us with four paths $\mathbf{S}_1 \in \mathcal{G}(u_1, v_1)$, $\tau_3 \in \mathcal{G}(u_1, c)$, $\tau_4 = \nu \cdot \nu \cdot \bullet$ and $\tau_5 \in \mathcal{G}(b, v_2)$, and we set $\mathbf{S}_2 = \tau_3 \cdot (c \cdot \nu \cdot d) \cdot \tau_5$;
4. if both $T_1(u_1, v_1, s)$ and $T_1(u_2, v_2, s)$ fail to hold, then ρ_6 provides us with six paths $\tau_0, \dots, \tau_5$, and we set $\mathbf{S}_1$ and $\mathbf{S}_2$ as above.

Once again, it follows that ρ'_2 can be defined in FO $[\leq, \pi_2, \rho_2]$.

Overall, the predicates T , π_2 , $\leq$ and ρ_2 can be initialized and maintained with first-order formulas, i.e. can be computed in FO. Hence, so can π_1 and ρ_1 , which constitute a solution of the Dyck reachability problem with witness.

F Computing *uniform* winning strategies: Accessibility sets

In the core of the paper, for readability and page-limit concerns, we have focused on a simple version of the dynamic parity problem, but the approach we propose applies to the more demanding problem of synthesizing a *uniform* winning strategy, that is, the synthesis of a V_0 -selector which defines a winning strategy from *every* winning state of the game.

In the static (*i.e.* non-dynamic) case, computing uniform memoryless strategies in a parity game is known to be reducible to computing several non-uniform winning strategies. More precisely, let $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_k \in W_0$ be the winning states for the player P_0 , with associated non-uniform V_0 -selectors $f^1, \dots, f^k$. For each integer i , let V^i be the set of those states that are reachable from σ_i when P_0 is bound to play according to the V_0 -selector f^i .

The following standard construction yields a uniform winning strategy g for P_0 :

- for each vertex $s \in V$, let i be the least integer, if any, such that $s \in V^i$: we set $g(s) = f^i(s)$, or we exclude s from the domain of g if $s \notin \text{dom}(f^i)$;
- we exclude from the domain $\text{dom}(g)$ each vertex $s \in V$ not yet treated.

Consequently, for every vertex σ_i and every V_0 -selector f^i , being able to compute the set V^i is crucial for computing uniform winning strategies. Such a computation will be made possible by using *accessibility sets*, which we define now.

Let σ be the unique element of the set Ψ_1 , let g be a V_0 -selector, and let $i \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}$ be some integer. We call *accessibility set* of g , and denote by α_i^g , the subset of $\Psi_i = \bigcup_{v \in \Theta_i} \mathbf{T}(v)$ defined by: $\alpha_i^g = \{s \in \Psi_i \mid \exists k \geq 0 \text{ and an extension } f \text{ of } g \text{ such that } f^k(\sigma) = s\}$, where f^k denotes the k -th iterate of f .

Unlike selector views, the accessibility sets of g cannot be computed directly in the same decremental fashion as above. However, once the selector views ω_i^g and ω_i^{*g} are known, the accessibility sets α_i^g can be computed in an *incremental* fashion.

Since $\Psi_1 = \{\sigma\}$, it is clear that $\alpha_1^g = \{\sigma\}$. We compute then the sets α_i^g for $i \in \{2, \dots, \ell\}$. If i is non-critical, then $\Psi_i \subseteq \Psi_{i-1}$, and therefore we have $\alpha_i^g = \alpha_{i-1}^g \cap \Psi_i$.

Henceforth, we assume that $i \geq 2$ is critical, whence $\Psi_i = \Psi_{i-1} \uplus \{\theta_i\}$, and computing α_i^g amounts to deciding whether $\theta_i \in \alpha_i^g$:

- If $\theta_i \in \alpha_i^g$, let f be an extension of g such that $f^k(\sigma) = \theta_i$ for some integer $k \geq 1$, and let us assume that k is minimal.

If $\sigma \in \mathbf{T}(v_{i-1})$, then there exists a maximal integer $m \leq k-1$ such that $f^m(\sigma) \in \mathbf{T}(v_{i-1})$. Furthermore, if $\sigma \notin \mathbf{T}(v_{i-1})$, recall that v_{i-1} must be the father of v_i , so that $\mathbf{T}(v_{i-1})$ is a separator of V that leaves the vertices σ and θ_i in two distinct connected components of $V \setminus \mathbf{T}(v_{i-1})$. Hence, in that case too, there exists a maximal integer $m \leq k-1$ such that $f^m(\sigma) \in \mathbf{T}(v_{i-1})$.

Let $s = f^m(\sigma)$. Then, we know that $s \in \mathbf{T}(v_{i-1}) \subseteq \mathbf{T}(v_i)$ and that $s \in \alpha_{i-1}^g$. By maximality of m and minimality of k , the vertices $f^{m+1}(\sigma), \dots, f^{k-1}(\sigma)$ all belong to $\Psi_{>i-1}(v_i)$. It follows that either $f(s) = \theta_i$ or $f_i(v_i, s) \in \{\theta_i\} \times \mathbb{N}$.

- Conversely, let us assume that there exists a vertex $s \in \mathbf{T}(v_i) \cap \alpha_{i-1}^g$ such that $f(s) = \theta_i$ or $f_i(v_i, s) \in \{\theta_i\} \times \mathbb{N}$. In both cases, there exists a positive integer ℓ such that $f^\ell(s) = \theta_i$, and from now on we assume that ℓ is minimal.

Let m be an integer and h be an extension of g such that $h^m(\sigma) = s$. We define an extension φ of g by:

$$\varphi: t \mapsto \begin{cases} f(t) & \text{if } t = f^u(s) \text{ for some integer } u \leq \ell - 1 \\ h(t) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

It is immediate that φ is a well-defined extension of g and that $\theta_i = \varphi^z(\sigma)$ for some integer $z \leq \ell + m$.

Moreover, for all vertices $s \in \mathbf{T}(v_i)$ and all extensions f of g , observe that $f(s) = \theta_i$ if and only if there exists sets $S, T \in 2^{\mathbf{T}(v_i)}$ such that $s \in T$ and that (f, S, T) is adapted to g at step i (the concept of adapted triples was introduced at the end of the proof of Proposition 10). In conclusion:

- if there exists a function $\varphi \in \omega_i^{*g}$, sets $S, T \in 2^{\mathbf{T}(v_i)}$ and a vertex $s \in T \cap \mathbf{T}(v_i) \cap \alpha_{i-1}^g$ such that (φ, S, T) is relevant for g at step i , then we have $\alpha_i^g = \alpha_{i-1}^g \cup \{\theta_i\}$;
- if there exists a function $\varphi \in \omega_i^{*g}$ and a vertex $s \in \mathbf{T}(v_i) \cap \alpha_{i-1}^g$ such that $\varphi(s) \in \{\theta_i\} \times \mathbb{N}$, then we have $\alpha_i^g = \alpha_{i-1}^g \cup \{\theta_i\}$;
- otherwise, we have $\alpha_i^g = \alpha_{i-1}^g$,

where the sets of functions $\omega_i^{*g}(v)$ were introduced while proving Proposition 10 and were proved to be FO-definable using ω_{i+1}^g . In particular, for *all* integers $i \leq \ell - 1$ (including $i = 1$ and non-critical indices i), there exists a FO-definable function $\mathbf{A}_i$ such that $\alpha_i^g = \mathbf{A}_i(\alpha_{i-1}^g, \omega_{i+1}^g)$.

G Refining the graph of Subsection 4.4

We target the resolution of the uniform version of our problem (see the discussion in Appendix F). We thus formally construct an extended graph with extra information for computing the accessibility sets.

More precisely, we would like to compute the set

$$S = \bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} \alpha_i^g = \{s \in V \mid \exists k \geq 0 \text{ and an extension } f \text{ of } g \text{ such that } f^k(\sigma) = s\}.$$

Since ℓ we proven to be non-critical, we have in fact $S = \bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq \ell-1} \alpha_i^g$: we will rely below on this characterization.

We prove here that checking whether a vertex $\sigma \in V$ is winning for P_0 , selecting a winning V_0 -selector g for P_0 (if some exists) and then computing the set S is reducible to the Dyck problem with witness in some graph Γ_G which we define below, and which is a variant of the graph constructed in Section 4.4. Recall Section E, where the Dyck problem with witness is defined, and a dynamic solution to that problem is provided.

We build an acyclic labelled graph Γ_G as follows. This graph is a variant of the graph described in Section 4.4, whose structure has been modified to take into account accessibility sets and to face issues that will be addressed in Appendix I below.

For all integers $i \leq \ell$, we denote by Λ_i the set $\prod_{x \in \Theta_i} 2^{\Lambda(x)}$. A nominal vertex of Γ_G is a triple (i, Z, A) with $Z \in \Lambda_i$ and $A \subseteq \Psi_{i-1}$.

For all non-critical values of i , we add neutral edges: $(i+1, Z, A) \xrightarrow{\bullet} (i, Z', A')$ where $Z = \Omega_i(Z)$ and $A' = A \cap \Psi_i$.

Then, let us order the vertices of the graph (V, E) in some way, thereby endowing the set V with a linear order $\leq$. Consider some critical index i , and let $s_1 \leq \dots \leq s_k$ be the vertices in $\mathbf{T}(v_i)$. Let us also use a fresh symbol s_{k+1} . Recall that a pair of vectors $(\mathbf{B}_{\theta_i, s})_{s \in \mathbf{T}(v_i)}$ and $(\mathbf{B}'_{s, \theta_i})_{s \in \mathbf{T}(v_i)}$ is said to be suitable at step i if their entries are non-empty subsets of $\{\perp, \top\}$.

Thus Γ_G additionally contains the following edges and vertices, for all sets $Z \in \Lambda_{i+1}$ and $A \subseteq \Psi_i$, all integers $a \in [i, k]$ and all vectors $\mathbf{B}$ and $\mathbf{B}'$ suitable at step i :

- $(i+1, Z, A) \xrightarrow{i, Z, A, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{B}'} (\theta_i, s_1, 0)$;
- $(\theta_i, s_a, 0) \xrightarrow{\theta_i, s_a, \beta} (\theta_i, s_a, 1) \xrightarrow{s_a, \theta_i, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{B}'} (\theta_i, s_{a+1}, 0)$ for all $\beta \in \text{choice}(\theta_i, s_a)$;
- $(s_a, \theta_i, 0) \xrightarrow{s_a, \theta_i, \beta'} (s_a, \theta_i, 1) \xrightarrow{s_a, \theta_i, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{B}'} (\theta_i, s_{a+1}, 0)$ for all $\beta' \in \text{choice}(s_a, \theta_i)$;
- $(\theta_i, s_{k+1}, 0) \xrightarrow{\bullet} (\theta_i, s_{k+1}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{B}', 0)$;
- $(\theta_i, s_{a+1}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{B}', 0) \xrightarrow{s_a, \theta_i, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{B}'} (s_a, \theta_i, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{B}', 1) \xrightarrow{s_a, \theta_i, \beta'} (s_a, \theta_i, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{B}', 0)$ for $\beta' = \mathbf{B}'_{s_a, \theta_i}$;
- $(s_a, \theta_i, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{B}', 0) \xrightarrow{\theta_i, s_a, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{B}'} (\theta_i, s_a, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{B}', 1) \xrightarrow{\theta_i, s_a, \beta} (\theta_i, s_a, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{B}', 0)$ for $\beta = \mathbf{B}_{\theta_i, s_a}$;
- $(\theta_i, s_1, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{B}', 0) \xrightarrow{i, Z, A, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{B}'} (i, Z', A')$ where $Z' = \Omega_i(Z, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{B}')$ and $A = \mathbf{A}_i(A', Z)$.

In the sequel, we call *nominal path* every labelled path of the form $(i+1, Z) \rightarrow (i, Z')$ or

$$\begin{aligned} & (i+1, Z, A) \rightarrow (\theta_i, s_1, 0) \rightarrow (\theta_i, s_1, 1) \rightarrow (s_1, \theta_i, 0) \rightarrow (s_1, \theta_i, 1) \rightarrow \dots \\ & \dots \rightarrow (s_k, \theta_i, 1) \rightarrow (\theta_i, s_{k+1}, 0) \rightarrow (\theta_i, s_{k+1}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{B}', 0) \rightarrow (s_k, \theta_i, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{B}', 1) \rightarrow \dots \\ & \dots \rightarrow (s_1, \theta_i, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{B}', 0) \rightarrow (\theta_i, s_1, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{B}', 1) \rightarrow (\theta_i, s_1, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{B}', 0) \rightarrow (i, Z', A'). \end{aligned}$$

Due to the layered structure of the graph Γ_G , every Dyck path in Γ_G is either a sub-path of a nominal Dyck path or of concatenation of nominal Dyck paths; in the latter case, we call the path a *generic Dyck path*.

Hence, let $\mathcal{P}_\Gamma$ be the class of generic Dyck paths in Γ_G with source in $\{(\ell, \Omega_\ell, A) \mid A \subseteq \Psi_{\ell-1}\}$ and with sink in $\{(1, Z, \emptyset) \mid Z \subseteq \Lambda(v_1)\}$. For each path $\pi \in \mathcal{P}_\Gamma$, we let

- $Z(\pi)$ be the subset of $\Lambda(v_1)$ such that $(1, Z(\pi), \emptyset)$ is the sink of π ;
- $E(\pi)$ be the subset of E defined as

$$E(\pi) = \left\{ (\theta_i, s) \left| \begin{array}{l} i \text{ is critical, } \theta_i \in V_0, s \in \mathbf{T}(v_i) \text{ and} \\ \pi \text{ goes through a vertex } (\theta_i, s_{k+1}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{B}', 0) \text{ with } \mathbf{B}_{\theta_i, s} = \{\top\} \end{array} \right. \right\} \cup \left\{ (s, \theta_i) \left| \begin{array}{l} i \text{ is critical, } s \in V_0 \cap \mathbf{T}(v_i) \text{ and} \\ \pi \text{ goes through a vertex } (\theta_i, s_{k+1}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{B}', 0) \text{ with } \mathbf{B}'_{s, \theta_i} = \{\top\} \end{array} \right. \right\};$$

- $V(\pi)$ be the subset of V defined as $V(\pi) = \bigcup \{A \subseteq V \mid \pi \text{ uses some vertex } (i, Z, A)\}$.

The following result follows directly from the above classification of Dyck paths in Γ_G and from Sections 4.3 and F (it refines Proposition 11).

► **Proposition 13.** *For every V_0 -selector g , there exists a unique Dyck path $\pi^g \in \mathcal{P}_\Gamma$ such that $E(\pi^g) = \{(s, g(s)) \mid s \in \text{dom}(g)\}$. The function $g \mapsto \pi^g$ is a bijection from the set of V_0 -selectors to $\mathcal{P}_\Gamma$. Moreover, we have $Z(\pi^g) = \omega_i^g$, i.e. g ensures P_0 's victory when the play is in σ if, and only if, $Z(\pi^g) = \{\sigma \mapsto \top\}$. In addition, the set $V(\pi^g)$ is equal to the union of accessibility sets $\bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq \ell-1} \alpha_i^g$.*

Consequently, answering the non-uniform two-player parity game problem amounts to checking if there exists a Dyck path $\pi \in \mathcal{P}_\Gamma$ such that $Z(\pi) = \{\sigma \mapsto \top\}$ and, if yes, to computing the sets $E(\pi)$ and $V(\pi)$.

H Refining the complexity analysis

While the results of Appendix D hold in the framework of Theorem 1, we need to extend them to a broader framework, where (a) witnesses are maintained, which forces us to precompute and maintain an additional predicate ρ_2 (see Appendix E), and (b) the underlying auxiliary graph is that of Appendix G.

This proof extension is immediate, due to the following remarks:

- the precomputation of the vertices and edges of Γ_G is exactly the same;
- we only know that paths of length $32(\kappa + 1) + 3$ (and not only 3 like in Appendix D) contain nominal vertices, hence we modify the notion of *short* path to include all paths of length at most $32(\kappa + 1) + 3$;
- all the other arguments used to prove that T or π_2 can be precomputed need no further change, and those used for computing π_2 also allows us to compute ρ_2 ;
- it is still straightforward that edge membership in Γ_G and the predicates T , π_2 and ρ_2 can be updated with FO formulas.

I From the non-uniform to the uniform parity game problem, with additional update operations

We finish by extending the scope of Theorem 1 in two different directions: first we extend our algorithm to solve parity games *uniformly* (using the construction of Appendix G), computing all the winning states and a uniform winning strategy from this winning region. We then add new operations by which the color and owner of a state of the parity game can be modified.

I.1 Towards uniformity

We first consider *uniformity*, showing that computing both the set W_0 of vertices that are winning for P_0 and a uniform V_0 -strategy f_0 that leads to P_0 's victory whenever the play is in W_0 can be performed in LOGSPACE-DynFO, provided that the only update operations are insertions and deletions of edges.

Indeed, thanks to Theorem 1, for each vertex $\sigma \in V$, we can check whether $\sigma \in W_0$ and, if yes, we can compute a V_0 -strategy g^σ and the set V^σ of those vertices that are accessible from σ if P_0 is bound to play according to the strategy g^σ . For every σ , we write Γ^σ for the acyclic graph computed for σ in Appendix G (sketched version in Subsection 4.4). Likewise, we denote by $\mathcal{D}^\sigma = (\mathcal{T}^\sigma, \mathbf{T}^\sigma)$ the tree decomposition rooted at σ , by v_i^σ the i -th element of the depth-first traversal of $\mathcal{T}^\sigma$, and so on.

Performing these computations for all vertices σ , with FO updates, can be done as follows. For each vertex $\sigma \in V$, Proposition 11 states that computing g^σ and V^σ is reducible to the Dyck accessibility problem with witnesses on some acyclic graph Γ^σ . Computing naively g^σ and V^σ in parallel would result, for each update, in adding one edge and deleting another edge in each of the $|V|$ graphs Γ^σ , and this would result in a polynomial number of FO computations, which might not be in FO.

Instead we proceed as follows. First, we unite the graphs Γ^σ in one single graph Γ , replacing each vertex $\mathbf{v}$ of Γ^σ by a pair $(\sigma, \mathbf{v})$, and replacing each label λ or $\bar{\lambda}$ (with the exclusion of neutral labels $\bullet$) by a pair (σ, λ) or $\sigma, \bar{\lambda}$.

Doing so, we have juxtaposed $|V|$ disjoint graphs Γ^σ into one single graph Γ .

Then, we glue some vertices of these graphs Γ^σ . For each pair $(s, t) \in V^2$ of vertices of our initial graph $G = (V, E)$, some graphs Γ^σ contain nodes $(\sigma, s, t, 0)$ and $(\sigma, s, t, 1)$: we merge the nodes $(\sigma, s, t, 0)$ into one single node $(s, t, 0)$, and the nodes $(\sigma, s, t, 1)$ into one single node $(s, t, 1)$. Similarly, for each label for all $\beta \in \text{choice}(s, t)$, we merge the labels (σ, s, t, β) into one single label (s, t, β) , and the labels σ, s, t, β into one single label $\bar{s}, t, \beta$.

The new labelled edges $(s, t, 0) \rightarrow (s, t, 1)$ play the role of hubs. They ensure that, if one edge (s, t) of G is changed, then only one labelled edge $(s, t, 0) \xrightarrow{s, t, \beta} (s, t, 1)$ is removed from Γ , and one labelled edge $(s, t, 0) \xrightarrow{s, t, \beta'} (s, t, 1)$ is added instead.

These merges may introduce cycles inside the graph Γ , but we may still view each graph Γ^σ as an acyclic subgraph of Γ , whose vertices either are merged vertices or are of the form $(\sigma, \mathbf{v})$, and whose edges are either hubs, or have a label $\bullet$ or (σ, λ) or $\sigma, \bar{\lambda}$. Hence, we may compute g^σ and V^σ in parallel by using the graph Γ^σ , although each edge insertion or deletion in G results in only one edge insertion and one edge deletion in Γ .

Finally, notice that a naive implementation of the approach above would require updating polynomially-many predicates at each step. However, those $|V|$ predicates (of arity k , say) would be updated uniformly, and could be represented as a single predicate of arity $k + 1$ (with one extra variable for σ) that would be updated by a single FO formula.

This already provides us with a way to compute the set W_0 itself. Moreover, we derive from the set W_0 and the strategies g^σ and sets V^σ the following uniform winning strategy g , which we already described in Section F. Letting $\leq$ be an arbitrary linear order on V :

- for each vertex $s \in V$, let σ be the least vertex of W_0 (for the order $\leq$) such that $s \in V^\sigma$, if such a vertex exists, and we set $g(s) = g^\sigma(s)$, or we exclude s from the domain of g if $s \notin \text{dom}(g^\sigma)$;
- we exclude from the domain $\text{dom}(g)$ each vertex $s \in V$ not yet treated.

Such a computation can be performed thanks to a FO formula, which indeed proves that the set W_0 and the function g can be computed by using FO updates.

1.2 Changing Vertex Ownership and Color

We show now that allowing to transfer a vertex from V_0 to V_1 or vice-versa as an update operation does not increase the dynamic complexity of the uniform two-player parity game problem. Indeed, instead of studying the graph $G = (V, E)$ endowed with a partition of V into two sets V_0 and V_1 and with a coloring function $c: V \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, we first study the auxiliary graph $\mathbf{G} = (\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{E})$ with a partition of $\mathbf{V}$ into sets $\mathbf{V}_0$ and $\mathbf{V}_1$ and a coloring function $\mathbf{c}: \mathbf{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ defined as follows:

- $\mathbf{V} = V \times \{0, 1, 2\}$;
- $\mathbf{V}_0 = V \times \{0\}$, and $\mathbf{V}_1 = V \times \{1, 2\}$;
- $\mathbf{c}: (s, i) \mapsto c(s)$ for all $s \in V$ and $i \in \{0, 1, 2\}$;
- $\mathbf{E} = \{((s, i), (t, 2)) \mid i \in \{0, 1\} \text{ and } (s, t) \in E\} \cup \{((s, 2), (s, i)) \mid s \in V_i\}$.

If $\mathcal{D} = (\mathcal{T}, \mathbf{T})$ is a tree decomposition of G of width κ , then $\mathcal{D}' = (\mathcal{T}, \mathbf{T}')$ is a tree decomposition of $\mathbf{G}$ of width at most $3\kappa + 2$, where $\mathbf{T}'$ is defined by $\mathbf{T}': v \mapsto \mathbf{T}(v) \times \{0, 1, 2\}$. Moreover, transferring a vertex s from V_i to V_{1-i} in G amounts to deleting the edge $((s, 2), (s, i))$ and adding the edge $((s, 2), (s, 1-i))$ in $\mathbf{G}$.

This means that dynamically solving the uniform two-player parity game problem with edge insertions/deletions and transfer of vertices between V_0 and V_1 is bfo-reducible to solving the same problem with only edge insertions/deletions.

Similarly, further allowing modifications the color $c(s)$ of a vertex $s \in V$ as an update operation does not increase the dynamic complexity of the uniform two-player parity game problem. This time, instead of studying the graph $G = (V, E)$ endowed with a partition of V into two sets V_0 and V_1 and with a coloring function $c: V \rightarrow \{1, \dots, \mathbf{C}\}$, we first study the auxiliary graph $\mathbf{G} = (\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{E})$ with a partition of $\mathbf{V}$ into sets $\mathbf{V}_0$ and $\mathbf{V}_1$ and a coloring function $\mathbf{c}: \mathbf{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ defined as follows:

- $\mathbf{V} = V \times \{-1, 0, 1, \dots, \mathbf{C}\}$;
- $\mathbf{V}_0 = V_0 \times \{-1, 0, 1, \dots, \mathbf{C}\}$, and $\mathbf{V}_1 = V_1 \times \{-1, 0, 1, \dots, \mathbf{C}\}$;
- $\mathbf{c}: (s, i) \mapsto \max\{i, 1\}$ for all $s \in V$ and $i \in \{-1, 0, 1, \dots, \mathbf{C}\}$;
- $\mathbf{E} = \{((s, 0), (t, -1)) \mid (s, t) \in E\} \cup \{((s, -1), (s, i)) \mid s \in V, 1 \leq i \leq \mathbf{C}\} \cup \{((s, c(s)), (s, 0)) \mid s \in V\}$.

If $\mathcal{D} = (\mathcal{T}, \mathbf{T})$ is a tree decomposition of G of width κ , then $\mathcal{D}' = (\mathcal{T}, \mathbf{T}')$ is a tree decomposition of $\mathbf{G}$ of width at most $(\mathbf{C} + 2)(\kappa + 1) - 1$, where $\mathbf{T}'$ is defined by $\mathbf{T}': v \mapsto \mathbf{T}(v) \times \{-1, 0, 1, \dots, \mathbf{C}\}$. Moreover, replacing the value u of the color of a vertex s by the new value v amounts to deleting the edge $((s, u), (s, 0))$ and adding the edge $((s, v), (s, 0))$ in $\mathbf{G}$.

References

- 25 David A. Mix Barrington, Neil Immerman, and Howard Straubing. On uniformity within NC^1 . *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 41(3):274–306, December 1990.
- 26 Michael Elberfeld, Andreas Jakoby, and Till Tantau. Logspace versions of the theorems of Bodlaender and Courcelle. In *Proceedings of the 51st Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS'10)*, pages 143–152. IEEE Comp. Soc. Press, October 2010.
- 27 William Hesse. *Dynamic Computational Complexity*. PhD thesis, Department of Computer Science, University of Massachusetts at Amherst, USA, September 2003.
- 28 Neil Immerman. *Descriptive complexity*. Graduate texts in computer science. Springer-Verlag, 1999.
- 29 Pablo Muñoz, Nils Vortmeier, and Thomas Zeume. Dynamic graph queries. Research Report 1512.05511, arXiv, December 2015.

- 30 Sushant Patnaik and Neil Immerman. Dyn-FO: A parallel, dynamic complexity class. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 55(2):199–209, October 1997.
- 31 Volker Weber and Thomas Schwentick. Dynamic complexity theory revisited. *Theory of Computing Systems*, 40(4):355–377, June 2007.
- 32 Thomas Zeume. *Small Dynamic Complexity Classes*. PhD thesis, Dortmund University, Germany, May 2015.